

The Classical Review

MAY 1892.

THE NASAL SONANT.

As this subject has of late received a considerable degree of attention in the columns of the *Classical Review*, perhaps I may be permitted to submit some observations which, I venture to hope, will remove certain difficulties and present a connected view of the phonetic principles involved. The discussion of the subject is so apt to diverge into side issues and isolated controversial points that its broad outlines tend to become obscured.

1. The nasal sonant is a nasal which assumes the function of a sonant, i.e. a sound capable of forming by itself a syllable. Thus, when we say *bottom* (= bot-m) or *button* (= but-n), *m* and *n* are sonants.

2. It is manifestly impossible to separate such cases from the analogous function of liquid sonants. Thus, when we say *little* (= lit-l), we have a phenomenon strictly analogous to that of *bot-m* and *but-n*.

3. We find further, that the liquid sonants are uniformly represented in the various I. G. languages by definite syllabic forms. Thus *ṛ* appears as *r* in Sanscrit, as *ṛp* or *pa* in Greek, as *or* in Latin, as *ri* in Keltic, as *ru*, *ur* in Gothic, as *ir* in the Baltic group, as *rī* in Old Slavonic and so on.

Similarly we find that the assumed nasal sonant is represented by definite syllabic combinations in the several I. G. languages. Thus, before explosives, spirants, and in the auslaut, *m*, *n* are represented by *a* in Sanscrit and Greek, by *en*, *em* in Latin, by *un* in German, &c. Hence, *śatám*, *ékarón*, *centum*, *hund* (Gothic); *dāśa*, *déka*, *decem*, *taíhun* (Gothic, where *ai* = *e*: Brugmann's *Grundriss* I. 25).

4. We find also that normally the liquid and nasal sonants occur in non-accented

syllables. Thus *ἔδρακ-ε*, *á-drša-t*; *πόδα* (= *pód-m*), *péd-em*, &c. Where deviation from this principle occurs we must postulate a change of accent, which is besides frequently supported by the analogy of Sanscrit, e.g. *μάρναι* from **μαρ-νᾱ-μι* = Sanscrit *mr-nā-mi*; *βάσσω* for *gm-skó*, because the analogous form in Sanscrit accented as a rule the verbal suffix, as *pṛchāmi* (ask, *prec-or*).

5. It is further evident that the sonantic function of the liquids and nasals results from the weakening of the root by the dropping of the characteristic vowel *e*. Thus *ἔτραπ-ον* = *ἔ-τρ-πον*, *ἔπαθ-ον* = *ε-πῆθ-ον* from *√πενθ-* (as in *πένθ-ος*). Accordingly, the sonantic function of liquids and nasals coincides with the weak form or low grade (*Tiefstufe*) of the verb, and is strictly in accord with the lowering of *πετ-* (in *πέτομαι*) to *πτ-* in *ἔπτ-όμην*, and of *λείπ-* (in *λείπω*) to *λιπ-* (in *ἔλιπ-ον*).

6. But a difficulty here emerges, upon which Dr. Fennell lays great stress in his *Essay on the Nasal Sonant* in Vol. V. p. 453. In *ἔτραπ-ον* from *τρέπω*, the liquid still survives, but in *ἔχαδ-ον* (for *ε-χῆδ-ον*) from *√χενδ-* the nasal has disappeared. The following considerations may help to remove this difficulty.

(a). It is pretty clear that in Greek and Latin the nasals were more lightly and obscurely pronounced than with us. Thus, suffixal *m* and *n* interchange readily in Greek and Latin, *πόντον* appearing as *pont-un* for *pont-om*. Again, final *m* was elided in Latin before a vowel, a tendency we do not observe in our language. Further, the nasals tend to be absorbed before *s* in Latin and Greek. Thus *τὰς* = *ταυς*, *pedēs* = *pedems*, &c.

(b). The French nasals *en, on, un, in, &c.*, indicate the tendency of the nasals to become nasalised vowels.

(c). The existence of *l mouillée* in French shows us how a *liquid* may disappear. Thus *fille* sounds *fiy'*. If in given circumstances a liquid may be vocalised in French, why may not a nasal become vocalised in Greek in given circumstances peculiar to the phonetic idiosyncrasy of the language?

(d). Again, *alter* becomes *autre*, *falsa* becomes *fausse*, i.e. a liquid, under given circumstances, gives place to a vowel sound.

(e). Further, in the Scottish dialect the auslaut *-l* disappears. Thus *dall* becomes *d'*, *fall*, *fà*, &c. Probably this is the last stage assumed by *l mouillée*. Whether this is due to French influence or not I leave undetermined.

It is of course, not pretended that these modifications have any *direct* connection with the sonantic function of liquids and nasals: all that they indicate is that under certain conditions phonetic peculiarities are evolved just as striking and *sui generis* as the reduction of *η* to *α*.

7. How are we to explain this reduction? It is conceivable that *η* had originally a sound like the French nasal *an*. If so, the transition to *α* would be easy. Here again we must recur to the case of the liquid sonants. And the question is: Wherein does *ζ* differ from *er*, so that for example the root *per* (Sanskrit *par*, fill) is reduced to *πῆ-νᾶτι*? And how does *-ep* differ from *pa* in *περ-τω* (*πεῖρω*), *ε-παρ-ω*? To our ears *πα* is no quicker or easier in articulation than *περ*. And why should *ap, pa* represent a sonant and not *ep*? It appears to me that a fundamental misconception exists on this subject; and the difficulty is removed if we perceive that the reduction of *περ* to *πῆ* (*παρ*) does not imply the weakening of a sound by the omission of a vocalic element but rather indicates the *shifting of a sound to an easier plane*. Taking the Sanskrit *ṛ* as an example we find that it is a cerebral (*mūrdhanya*), i.e. in pronouncing it the tongue is brought back and bent upwards to the roof of the hard palate. The syllable *ri* in *merrily* approximates to this sound. Consonantal *r* on the other hand is in most languages alveolar, i.e. the tongue is thrust forward till its tip approaches the sockets of the upper teeth. (See Sievers, *Grundzüge der Phonetik*, 3rd Edition, p. 106.) This is the normal pronunciation of *r* in English; but in such words as *pride, propose* the *r* is more coronal in character, that is becomes a sonant like *ṛ*,

so much so that *propose* in hasty articulation approaches *p'pose*. We may accordingly assume with some degree of probability that in *er* (*ep*) the *r*-sound was distinctly alveolar, but in *ṛ* (*ap*) it became cerebral or coronal (to use the more general term). That the latter sound is easier of articulation and therefore lends itself better to a quickened utterance is experimentally obvious. Further, in sounding the syllable *ēr* the tongue sinks, whereas in sounding *ar* the tongue leaves its indifferent position and is drawn back with an upward tendency (Sievers, p. 91); so that for a coronal *ṛ*, *ar* is an easier combination than *er*. This appears to explain Greek *ap, αλ*. The equivalent combinations in the other languages may similarly be explained; and there is little practical difference to an English ear if we pronounce *merrily* as

mērally (Greek).
mērroly (Latin).
mērully (Gothic).
mērully (Slavonic).

8. Analogous to this process of shifting to an easier plane is the change of *m n* to *m η*, if these latter sounds became at first nasalised vowels. But why should these sounds be shifted to an easier plane? Manifestly for greater quickness of articulation, and this is desiderated by the effort of the voice to pass readily to the accented syllable. This brings us to the question of the Indo-Germanic accent: on which no doubt a volume might be written. The main point however in this connection is whether it was merely musical or stressed, i.e. whether the accented syllable was simply higher in pitch, or pronounced with a greater degree of energy and force. It seems to be generally admitted that in *historic* Greek and Sanscrit the accent was musical merely, and that *ἄνθρωπος* was pronounced in some such way as



How else indeed are we to account for the fact that the accent did not interfere with the quantity? In modern Greek where a stress has superseded the musical accent *ἄνθρωπος* is pronounced as if it were *ánthrōpos*.

But in what may be termed pre-historic Greek and Sanscrit it seems to be probable that the accent was stressed or 'expiratory' (see Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.* § 66). The weakening of verbal roots, as of *petō* to *ptō*,

can hardly be explained on any other hypothesis. That the incidence of a stress on the first syllable of a word tends to shorten or obscure the vowel sounds of the succeeding syllables, or conversely, is perceived at once when we pronounce *accessory*, *continuity*, *maidenly* (mēdnlī), *represent* (reprēnt), and so forth.

If then the archaic accent was wholly or even partially expiratory we can understand how *λειπ-* was reduced to *λιπ-*, *περ-* to *πτ-*, *πενθ-* to *πνθ-* (*παθ*), *τρεπ-* to *τρηπ-* (*τραπ*), &c.

9. A remaining question, and a very perplexing one is: Could the nasal sonant receive the musical accent? On this point Dr. Fennell (Vol. V. p. 453) speaks with no uncertain sound. He says: 'A sonant nasal cannot be properly said to be capable of learning the musical accent. It is a hum, and there is no reason to suppose that the vocal chords are tightened so as to vibrate rhythmically any more than when a soft *s* or a soft mute is uttered unless one hums chantingly.—The sound when once uttered seems to be quite stable.'

The whole force of this argument rests upon the assumption that the nasal sonant is a 'hum.' If however there is any validity in the foregoing observations the nasal sonant is not a 'hum,' either when it appears as *a* or as *av*, unless indeed I misunderstand the phonetic significance of the term. But I agree with Dr. Fennell to this extent that the nasal sonant was *originally* and *primarily* incapable of bearing an accent. Here again we cannot dissociate the question from the analogous case of the liquid sonants. Now these are not unfrequently accented. Thus *vīka* (=λύκος), *tīnam* (grass-stalk) which corresponds to Gothic *thaurmus* (thorn). So also *ἑπτὰ* (=septem) for I.G. *sept-m* exhibits the accent on the nasal sonant. All such examples however indicate in my opinion an abnormal transposition of the accent:

1. Because the very genesis of the sonantic character of liquids and nasals implies their non-accentuation.

2. Because such words as λύκος, ἄρκτος (*rksas*), *tīnam* are originally *nomina agentis* which tend to be accented on the final syllable (cf. ἀγωγός, ταγός, δοιδός, &c.).

Thus *λύκος* is from √*velk* (ἐλκω) and means the *tearing, rending* animal, ἄρκτος probably the *roarer* from *arc* (roar), while *tīnam* obviously comes from √*ter* to penetrate, pierce (Gr. τορεῖν, τέρετρον). In proportion however as the etymology of the word became obscured, arose the tendency to accent the first syllable in conformity to the analogy of other concrete nouns in *os*,

ov (as, am). See Lindner, *Altindische Nominalbildung* § 3, I.

3. Because we find similar cases of a retrocession of accent in verbal nouns, e.g. the abstracts in *-tis*. Thus *πίστις* (=πιθ-*tis*) from the weak form of *πιθ-* must originally have been *πισ-*tis**; *ρύσις* (=ρύ-*tis*) from *σπερ-* must have been *ρυν-*tis** (cf. Sanscrit *rūti*); *φᾶσις* from *φᾶ*, for *φᾶ-*tis**; *φύσις* for *φυν-*tis** from *φῦ* the weak form of *φεν*, *φῦ*. This transposition of the accent was obviously caused by a desire to discriminate nouns in *is* (*ews*) from nouns in *is* (*ōds*).

As regards *ἑπτὰ* it is to be noted that classic Sanscrit accents *sāpta*, and the word was originally accented *ἑπτα* otherwise we should have had *ἑπτάν*, because the nasal sonant in the auslaut takes the form of *a*: cf. *δέκα* = I.G. *dék-m*. According to Osthoff (*Morph. Untersuch.* I. p. 97) the accent *ἑπτὰ* is due to the analogy of *ὀκτώ* (Sanskrit veda-form *astā*). But Brugmann and Osthoff indicate the probability that there *was* an accented nasal sonant taking the form of *av* (see Brugmann's *Gr. Gram.* § 106, 3, *Grundriss* I. § 223, 235; Osthoff *Morph. Untersuch.* I. p. 98), and they base their theory upon the existence of such forms as *ἴασι*, *ἀγνῶσι*, &c. They point out that *ἴασι* = Sanscrit *yānti*. (Of course *ἴασι* = *ἰανσι* = *ἰαντι*.) I am however not at all convinced of the cogency of such examples. Assuming the correspondence of Greek *av* and Sanscrit *an* in this connection, we must note that *yānti* would appear in Greek as *ἄντι*, just as *γᾶς* answers to *ὄς*. Brugmann indeed (*Gr. Gram.* § 112, 1) explains the *i* of *ἴασι* by supposing it prefixed in deference to the analogy of *ἵμεν*, *ἵτε*, and this is no doubt probable enough. But is it not possible to explain the form *ἴασι* in another way, so as to obviate the necessity for the assumption that *ἴασι* implies *ἵπτι*? The form *ἴασι* cannot be dissociated from such forms as *ἴασι* (they are), *ἰστᾶσι* (for **ἰστᾶ-*asi** implied by Ionic *ἰστᾶσι*), *τιθέασι*, *διδᾶσι*, &c. All these however are neologisms, the earlier forms being *εἰσι*, *τιθεῖσι*, *διδῶσι* (which no doubt were subsequently accented according to the false analogy of *ἰστᾶσι*, and were originally *τιθεῖσι*, *διδῶσι*: see Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.* § 115, a). Still earlier and unmodified forms are *ἐντι* (for **ἐντι* = *σέντι*, the aspiration being dropped according to the analogy of *ἔσμεν*, *ἔστε*), *ἰστᾶντι*, *τιθεῖντι* and **διδῶντι* (as implied in *διδῶσι*). The suffix is *-ντι*, to which the reduplicated forms *ἰστᾶ*, *τιθε*, *διδῶ* are attached. In the case of **ἐντι* which is a consonantal root, a mediating vowel *ε* connects *σ* the weak form of *εσ* with the

suffix. But the suffix *-ντι* was directly attached to a root with a vowel auslaut. On this principle we have *φά-ντι*, **κίρνα-ντι* (implied in *κίρνασι* for **κίρνασι*), **πιμπρα-ντι* (implied in *πιμπρᾶσι* for **πιμπρασι*), **πιμπλα-ντι* (implied in *πιμπλᾶσι* for **πιμπλασι*), &c.

That is to say, the termination *-ᾶσι* is based upon forms accruing from vocalic roots in *-a* followed by the suffix *-ντι*. The form *-αντι*, thus established, was extended to verbs whose root did not end in *-a*. Hence *ῥᾶσι*, *ῖᾶσι*, *τιθέσαι*, &c., echo *φᾶσι*, &c. If this theory be correct, it is quite unnecessary to trace in *ῖᾶσι* an accented nasal sonant; and an embargo is removed from the nasal sonant which considerably embarrasses the handling of it.

By way of concluding remark I may

point out that if I am right in supposing that the phenomenon of the liquid and nasal sonants involves rather the shifting of the sounds *l, r, m, n* to an easier plane than the mere weakening and curtailment of the respective sounds, then we can have little difficulty in admitting the possibility of *long* sonants liquid and nasal; for all that *l, r, m, n* mean is that there was a lengthened insistence upon derivative sounds moving in an easier plane. For the present however I must refrain from discussing this interesting point. On the whole, then, and with the reservations and explanations advanced, I venture to express my conviction that Brugmann's theory of the nasal sonant remains sound and intact.

G. DUNN.

NOTES ON THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

Of the emendations in the text of the *Anthology* proposed by Mr. Tucker in the *Classical Review* for March, two may be unhesitatingly accepted, namely the change of punctuation in *Anth. Pal.* vi. 30 which makes clear sense of the MS. reading, and the brilliant correction of l. 3 in *Anth. Pal.* vii. 712. Perhaps in the latter *τάδε θ' οἷ κα μνάμαθ' ὀρώντι* (or *τάδε τ' οἷ κα μνάματ' ὀρώντι* as it would be written in pure Aeolic) is a trifling improvement on Mr. Tucker's *τάδε δ' οἷ* and also a little nearer the MS. *τὰ δέ τοι*. The other suggestions, I think, are less certain.

Anth. Pal. v. 237, where the Palatine MS. reads *ὄμματα δ' οὐ λείοντα φυλάσσεται*, either Hecker's *οὐ μύοντα* or Mr. Tucker's *οἰδᾶοντα* gives an unexceptionable sense and is properly derived from the MS. reading, so that it is not easy to decide between them. It is worth noticing that Jacobs must have been on the point of making Mr. Tucker's emendation when, with reference to his own conjecture *σταλάοντα*, he observes that *στ* and *οι* are frequently confused in the MS.

Anth. Pal. ix. 142, *ὅς πέτρων τόνδε κέκευθε δόμον*, where I adopted Brunck's *λέλογχε*, rejected by Jacobs, Mr. Tucker prefers to make the more serious alteration *ὅς πετρίνῳ τῷδε κέκευθε δόμῳ*. It is just possible however that the MS. reading may stand with *δόμον* as a sort of secondary accusative (cf. phrases like *προσθακίων ἔδραν* in Soph. *O.C.* 1166). The parallel from *Anth. Pal.* vi. 271 which Mr. Tucker cites,

Λέοντι altered to *Λέοντος* at the end of a line, is not sufficient to bear him out here.

Anth. Pal. vii. 277, *τίς ξένος, ὃ ναυηγέ; Λεόντιχος ἐνθάδε νεκρὸν εὔρεν κ.τ.λ.*, there are two objections to Mr. Tucker's *τίς τίνος*, one that it is hard to see how *τίνος* could have been corrupted into *ξένος*, the other that it is very awkward to make *τίς* and *Λεόντιχος* refer to different persons; any one reading the line would suppose as a matter of course that they were the same.

Anth. Pal. vii. 410 :

Θέσπις ὅδε, τραγικὴν ὅς ἀνέπλασε πρῶτος αἰοδὴν κομήταις νεαράς καινοτομῶν χάριτας

Βάχκος ὅτε τριθὺν κατάγοι χορόν, κ.τ.λ.

So the Palatine MS. (our sole authority here). The editors after Salmasius alter *ἀνέπλασε* to *ἀνέπλασα* in l. 1. Jacobs himself did not think his conjecture of *τρηνγκὸν* in l. 3 satisfactory, and I doubt whether I should not have done better to keep Heinsius' *τριττὴν* (to which *χορὸν* would be in apposition). Mr. Tucker's *βριθὴν* is very plausible. But *βριθὴς χορὸς* by itself could not mean a drunken chorus, for *gravis* and *gravis vino* mean very different things. We might keep the MS. *ἀνέπλασε* in l. 1 and read *Βάχκῳ ὅτε βριθὴν κατάγοι* (sc. Thespius himself) *χορόν*, but this brings back the difficulty of the change from 3rd to 1st person in the epigram.

Anth. Pal. ix. 314 :

ψυχρὸν δ' ἀκραὲς κράνα ὑποῖάχει MS. Pal.
ψυχρὸν δ' εὐκραεὶ κράνῳ ὑποῖάχει Plan. I

cannot help thinking that in Mr. Tucker's *ἵπαι ποτάγαι* the word *προσάγει*, 'provides,' is prosaic and not what we should expect from the extraordinary distinction and refinement of Anyte's style. Probably the true reading still remains to be discovered.

Anth. Pal. ix. 270, οὐδ' ἄλλων λὰξ ἱβανναόρος MS. *Pal.* ἱβάρνα χόρους Plan. There are two objections to Mr. Tucker's *ἱβάρνε κάρος*; first, that *ἐμέ* would be indispensable for the syntax, and secondly, that ἄλλων would be rather pointless. Here too the true reading is perhaps still unknown, and perhaps not certainly discoverable, for Marcus Argentarius is capable of almost any fantastic misuse of language.

I take this opportunity of adding notes on three other epigrams where I was obliged to leave the text in an unsatisfactory state in my book of selections.

Anth. Pal. vii. 636 :

Ποιμὴν ὦ μάκαρ, εἴθε κατ' οὐρεὺς ἐπροβάτευνον
κῆγῳ, ποιηρὸν τοῦτ' ἀνὰ λευκόλοφον
κριοῖς ἀγρηῆσσι ποτὲ βληχχόμενα βάζων.

Here I printed, in fault of anything better, Lobeck's suggestion, *κριοῖς ἀγρηῆσσι πότι βληχχῆτα βιβάζων*. I think we ought to read *κριοῖς ἀγρηῆσσι βοτὰ βληχχόμεν' ὁπάζων*, 'making the bleating flocks follow the leader rams.'

Anth. Pal. ix. 333 :

Στόμεν ἀλινράντοιο παρὰ χθαμαλὸν (χθαμαλὸν Plan.) χθόνα πόντον. It is almost impossible that so correct a writer as Mnaseas should have used ἀλινράντος in an active sense. Comparing Archias in *Anth. Pal.* vii. 278, ἣ γὰρ ἀλινρήκοις ὑπὸ δειράσιν ἀγχοῖσι πόντον, I

suspect that -αν χθόνα πόντον here is a corruption of ἀγχοῖσι πόντον, and that the whole line ran στόμεν ἀλινράντοιο παρὰ χθονὸς ἀγχοῖσι πόντον. For this rare use of παρὰ with the genitive see Liddell and Scott s.v. Παρὰ χθονός would almost inevitably become παρὰ χθόνα, and παρὰ χθόνα ἀγχοῖσι might then easily become παρὰ χθαμαλὸν or χθαμαλὸν χθόνα.

Anth. Pal. x. 8 :

Βαὺς ἰδεῖν ὁ Πιρήπος ἐπαιγιαλίτιδα ναῖω

χρηλὴν, αἰθνίας οὐποτε ἀντιβίας.

The use of the word *χρηλή*, taken in connexion with the subject and authorship of the epigram, points with high probability to its having been written for a statue of Priapus on one of the two moles or spits of land which gave its name to the small seaport of Chelae on the coast of Bithynia. Between two and three miles from Chelae the island of Thynias lay just off the coast. I should now read

χρηλὴν, Βιθύνας νάσον ἐναντιπέρας.

βιθύνας (νάσον) readily became *αἰθνίας* οὐ in an epigram dealing with the sea-shore, and then *ποτε* was inserted as a mere stop-gap to fill up the verse. For *ἐναντιπέρας* cf. Kaibel, *Epigr. Gr.* 981. The allusion to the town of Chelae without exactly naming it is like *Anth. Pal.* vii. 497 :

ἀλλά τις ἀκτὴ

Θυνιάς, ἣ νήσων Ποντιάδων τις ἔχει,

where the name of the celebrated Ἀκτὴ Θυνιάς on the coast of Thrace is brought in under a generalised form of expression. To speak of the island of Thynias as 'a Bithynian island' would be a similar artifice.

J. W. MACKAIL.

NOTES ON AESCHYLUS.

Aeschylus :—

Aesch. *Pers.* 814, 815.

κοιδέπω κακῶν
κρητὶς ὕπεστιν, ἀλλ' ἐτ' ἐκπαιδεύεται.

'The foundation is not yet laid (see *κρητὶς* and *ὑποβάλλειν* in Lex.) but is still being built up.'

Read ἐκΠΑΙΝΘΕῖται for ἐκΠΑΙΔΕῖται, and cf. Thuc. iv. 67 *πλυθεῖναι τείχη*. 'It is still being built to completion brick by brick.'

Ibid. 850.

ἐπαντιάζειν ἐμῷ παιδὶ πειράσομαι.

παῖδ' ἐμῷ is of course out of the question. The flatness of *πειράσομαι* needs no pointing out. Since *αι=ε* and *ι=η* in later Greek pronunciation, ἐμῷ παιδὶ is most likely to have arisen from ἐμπεδέη (adv.) 'I will try to meet my son with firmness.'

Eumen. 219.

εἰ τοῖσιν οὖν κτείνουσιν ἀλλήλους χαλᾶς
τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι μὴδ' ἐποπτεύειν κότῳ.

Read σὺν ἐσθαί, 'take cognisance.'

THOS. G. TUCKER.

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE FORMS OF THE NEGATIVE *NE*.

In the December number of this *Review*, p. 485, Mr. Darbshire confesses 'failure to understand Mr. Thomas's list of recorded forms of the I.E. negative *ne*-' which had appeared in the previous number, p. 434. I regret the obscurity and will endeavour by replying to Mr. Darbshire's objections to elucidate it.

1. 'What authority is there for I.E. *nī* and *nei*?' As regards *nī* v. below; *nei* is found in Latin inscriptions (Stolz *Lat. Gr.*² p. 273): it is common in Oscan inscriptions both as a simplex and in composition with *-que* in *neip* = *neque*. *neip* also coexists with *nep* in Umbrian. Thus *nei* is at least Italic. But since the movable *i* is found in other cases in I.E. (e.g. in the locatives and in the variation *ā* and *āi* in the fem. sing. and neut. pl. of pronouns), I infer that the form *nei* is also I.E. The inference is, however, unnecessary, since *nei* occurs in Gothic *nei*, in Lithuanian *nēi*, and in Iranian *naē-cis*, concerning which forms let me refer Mr. Darbshire to Brugmann's *Grundriss* ii. § 424, p. 787, where this class of cases is treated.

2. 'Or for the spelling *nae* (Brix on Plaut. *Trin.* 63)?' I must retract the equation of *nae* to Greek *vaí*, which was due to a momentary aberration. Mr. Darbshire may now proceed to criticize Brugmann in respect of the same error (*vide* his *Gk. Gr.*² § 201, 1 p. 223).

3. 'How is it possible to have an *a* in an *e*-root?' Let me point out that my list in no way implies an *a* in an *e*-root, since *na'i* might be to *ne* as *ga'i* *kaí* to *ge* *re* *que*, the stems being different. Yet if it is asked whether *a* can appear in the *e*-root, I answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Let me refer to Bartholomae's proof in Bezzenberger's *Beiträge* xvii. 92 *sqq.* I can supply Mr. Darbshire with other instances besides those quoted by Bartholomae.

4. 'Or to derive strong affirmatives like *vī* and *vaí* from the negative *ne*?'

It may interest Mr. Darbshire to learn that this derivation is nearly coeval with Comparative Philology, having originated with Bopp, whose opinion is accepted by Corssen and not rejected by Curtius. The obvious supposition is that both 'verily' and 'not' are derived from a common meaning which was neither 'yes' nor 'no.' But even a transition from 'yes' to 'no' is not impossible, as Shilleto's edition of the *De*

Falsa Legatione, Appendix C, may show. Shilleto actually says 'upon inquiry I am persuaded that it will be acknowledged that it (*vaí*) has a sort of negative meaning,' and later 'its affirmative usage is purely accidental.' In fact, I suppose that *vaí* became a strong affirmative from being used like *μὲν οὖν* to contradict by strengthening; cf. Shilleto *ibid.* Thirdly, let me point to Gk. *oū*, the Sanscrit representative of which *ā* is used both for 'and,' 'also' and for 'on the contrary,' 'yet,' &c.

5. 'That *nām* is from the negative *ne*—is I think impossible and is not even weakly supported by *οὐκοῦν*.' The derivation is Bopp's (*Engl. Trans.* ii. 522 *sqq.*). But why impossible? Schmalz tells us (*Lat. Gr.*² §§ 196–199) that *nām* and *enim* were originally particles of affirmation. Why should not these therefore be parallel to *vī* and *vaí*? And if *nā* = *oū* and *-m* = *oūv*, why should not *οὐκοῦν* 'even weakly support' *nām* so interpreted? I printed this suggestion, however, with a query.

6. 'ηu for ηn—are obviously misprints.' For the misprints I am not responsible.

Let me now briefly explain the meaning of my list. I suppose a particle *en* *eni* *nī* which may have meant 'away' or 'away there.' *en* and *eni* might perhaps also take the forms *ne* and *nei* (cf. the cases of alternative order in Brugm. *Gr.* ii. §§ 231–2–4–5) or else *e* in *ne* and *nei* might be formative. *nē* *nō* and *nō* would belong to *nē* in accordance with the ordinary vowel scales, and similarly *nōi* and *nōi*(?) to *nei*. *nā* and *nāi* would appear either in accordance with Bartholomae's discovery or with *a* as a new formative. In *nā* *ā* will be either the sound discussed in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* for May 21. 1891, or the *ā* of *māter* &c.: probably, I think, the former.

Now *eni* is the preposition *ἐν* *ἐν* *ἐν* *in*, which also appears in *ἐν-οι* 'some' and Sk. *anya* 'other'; for the formation cf. *πρόσω* = **πρωτι-ω*, *τόσος* = *τοτι-ος*, &c. The remaining forms I will not here discuss; with the exception of *nī*, which I find in Latin *nisi*, and the Sk. preposition *nī* = 'in,' 'down,' 'backwards.' I am aware that *nisi* is regarded as from *nesi* by assimilation (Stolz *Lat. Gr.*² § 28), but, if so, why have we *nevis* and not *nivis*? I will not, however, insist on finding *nī* in *nisi*, but rather rely on the general argument above.

I will now add some parallels :

- (1). *ne* : *nē* : *vaí* = δέ : δῆ : δαί
= τε *que* : : καί
(2). *nei* : *vaí* = εἰ : αἰ
(3). Sk *nī* : *nīs* : δῖ(ά) ? : Lat. *dis*-
(4). *nī* : *ne* = τι(ς) : τε
? (5). *ne* : *nām* = (ὅ)δε : (qui)dām.

The exact relationship of these stems is at present uncertain.

As this discussion is due to the extreme brevity of a note, wherein I recognized the priority of Mr. Wharton in separating *non* from *noenum*, I may here observe that, as has been pointed out to me, Mr. Wharton himself has a predecessor in Mr. Nixon, who in the *Journal of Philology*, vii. p. 35, 1877, separated *nōn* from *ne-unum*, regarding the former as a 'dialectic variation of *ne*': he does not, however, definitely derive *nōn* from *nō* + *ne*.

F. W. THOMAS.

1. MR. THOMAS'S note on *nī* and *nei* as amplified by his concluding remarks seems to me to rest on a serious misapprehension. I pass over his entirely nugatory Latin evidence (*nī* = *nē*si as *plico* = *plēco*, *nei* graphic variant of *nē* whence the later distinction of *nī*, *nē* like our *person*, *parson*) and refer him in turn to Brugmann's *Grundriss* ii. § 424 p. 787, where he will find that Brugmann is treating of *case-forms*, and postulates on the facts an I. E. form (locative) *nei* from the root *ne*. Mr. Thomas promptly proceeds to regard this as a *root* *nej*- and puts it through the regular gymnastics *noi*- and *nī*-, to say nothing of 'na'i.' He makes an analogous mistake when he refers to Brugm. *ib.* §§ 231 ff. for 'alternative order.' Brugmann justifies nothing of the kind. He is again discussing the mode in which *case-suffixes* are attached: in this case to a formative suffix already added. Then we have for example in the F. S. possible forms *-ej*- and *-i*-, and

in the C. S. *-es* and *-s* and these are combined so as to give either *ei-s* or *i-es* (with phonetic variants). This is therefore merely an example of the principle which I had occasion to state on p. 58 of this volume, and absolutely fails to justify an inversion of a root *en* into *ne* or *eni* into *nei*. Mr. Thomas's evidence for an I. E. root *nei* is therefore reduced to a Skt. preposition and the remarkable correspondence *τι* : *τε*.

3. The greater length of Mr. Thomas's present remarks enables me to see, what I did not before, that he is using a private terminology. The normal and certainly convenient use of *a*^x is to indicate the vowel of a root in its strong form when either its exact stage or its scale cannot be determined. For example no language has yet enabled us to determine the strong form of the root *siu* (Skt. *syn*, Lat. *suo*). It is therefore written *sia*^x*u*. But if, say, an Armenian form were discovered which proved that the root was *sieu*, it would thenceforward be so written. Mr. Thomas, from his reference to Bartholomae's well-known paper, evidently means *a* by *a*^x. He rather implies however that here as in the case of *nae* he is accepting the statements of others. This is not so, Bartholomae never uses *a*^x.

4. I fear my objection was not clearly stated: Mr. Thomas has certainly missed the point. I asked how he derived an affirmation from a *negative*. He replies 'all negations are derived from affirmatives.' I do not need any proof of this.

5. This is perhaps a question of judgment; but I should like to ask Mr. Thomas whether he believes (1) that at the time the illative use of *οἰκοῦν* arose in Greek, *οἶκ* still had an affirmative sense, or (2) that his authority Schmalz is wrong in supposing *nām* to be an affirmative particle, and should have called it a negative one. As the whole force of *οἰκοῦν* seems to me to lie in the *οἶν*, how *-m* can = *οἶν* and be at the same time a case-ending beats me.

H. D. DARBISHIRE.

ON THE TEXT OF THUCYDIDES, BOOK VII.

I.

As the British Museum MS. (*Britannicus* or *Londinensis*; No. 11, 727) of Thucydides has lately had considerable attention bestowed upon it, I wish to make

a few remarks on the published collations of the MS. in the seventh book, before submitting a few emendations of my own to the judgment of scholars. Stahl, presumably on the authority of Eggeling, describes the MS. (*edit. stereotypa* 1873) as *accurate et*

eleganter exarata, except where the 'later hands' have been at work. But this statement is inconsistent with that of van Herwerden (*Stud. Thuc.* p. v. 1868), who says that, setting aside the work of the 'later hands,' 'reliqua vetustissima sunt: exarata...manu eadem, quae elegantissima est, omnia. Dolendum est codicem non esse tam bonum quam antiquum; pertinet tamen, etiamsi a scriba exaratus est valde indocto et stupido, ad meliores.' Here is a plain conflict of opinion: a scribe who deserves to be called 'valde indoctus et stupidus' does not write 'accurate.' Nor would minute points of orthography be of any importance in a MS. written by such a scribe. Hude however, in his critical edition of books vi.—viii. (p. ii. note), implies that he should have recorded such points in his *apparatus* had it been possible to do so: 'hujus codicis testimonium in multis rebus, iis maxime quae ad orthographiam pertinent, non prolatum est; exempli causa haec affere libet: ἀλλά—ἀλλ', γε—γ', δέ—δ', ἐπί—ἐπ', μετά—μετ', ὅτε—ὄτ', τε—τ', εἰς—ἐς, εἰσω—ἔσω, σύν—σύν, οὕτως—οὕτω, περί—πéρι, αὐτόν—αὐτόν, -εία (velut in ἀνδρεία)—-ία, -εἰς (velut in ἱππείας)—-ῆς, -ην (velut in Τισσαφέρην)—-η, τὰ ἄλλα—τὰλλα similia, v. paragoeicum.' Having observed the orthography of this MS. with care, I do not think that anything of any value can be gained from it for settling the orthography of Thucydides. The spelling in all the cases mentioned by Hude is capricious, and I do not see what would be the use of recording all the readings of the MS. in most of the above cases. εἰς, σύν, τὲ (for τε or τ'), -ην (as Δημοσθένην vii. 86, 3), -εἰς (as χαλκίδεις ii. 79, 7), εἰσω, are common. Yet we have ἀχαρῆς or ἀχαρῆς, and ἐστᾶλλα (i.e. ἐς τᾶλλα) now and then, and these last, and other cases in which the scribe had singularly good fortune, might lead to a favourable opinion of the orthography. But what is to be said of συρακοῖσι, συρακοῖσαι, συράκονσαι, συράκονσαι, side by side; or of ἀμπρακιῶται and ἀμβρακιῶται in the same sentence? I fear that Herwerden's statement was, after all, more correct than Stahl's.

A new collation of the MS. in this book has been recently published by Dr. Holden. The learned editor remarks (p. 289 of his edition of book vii.): 'With regard to our own MS. M, whatever its critical value may be, I can fully corroborate the statement of Mr. E. C. Marchant in the *C.R.* vol. v. p. 22 that Eggeling's collation of it was very incomplete.' He then points out that

Stahl has made some corrections in the text on the authority of imaginary readings in M. This statement led me to hope that Dr. Holden had saved me the trouble of printing another collation of M. in an edition of the seventh book which I am preparing; *criticos odi apparatus*—but unfortunately the new collation, though much superior to Eggeling's, is disfigured by several errors and omissions. In the following list, Dr. Holden's reading is given in inverted commas: then comes what I believe to be the true reading in M. Where only one reading is given, the meaning is that Dr. Holden has omitted something which I think should be recorded.

- C. 1, 1. —παρεσκεύασαν' —ἐπαρεσκεύασαν.
 5. —ὀπλίτας ψιλοῦς, omitting καὶ [so T].
 C. 2, 4. —Τρογίλον, for Τρώγιλον.
 C. 5, 1. —ἀντεπαρετάσσοντο.
 C. 7, 4. —ἀνεπειρώοντο M qui in marg. ἀπεπειρώοντο ἐμελέτων addit'—marg. has ἀπεπειρώοντο καὶ ἐμελέτων, a schol. on the text.
 C. 8, 3. —'ἡ δὲ BC; ἡδὲ LM' [L=consensus of AEF]—M omits ἡ δὲ and has no ἡδὲ.
 C. 11, 1. —πρώτον for πρότερον.
 2. —ἐν τῇ Σκελίᾳ for ἐν Σ.
 C. 12, 5. —τὰ σφέτερα for τὰς σφετέρας.
 C. 14, 4. —'ἡμᾶς σαφῶς εἰδότες CLM'—M has σαφῶς ἡμᾶς εἰδότες.
 C. 18, 1. —ἐγένετο for ἐγγένητο.
 3. —'Επιδαύρου τι, omitting τε [so T].
 C. 19, 3. —ἐς before ἑξακοσίους [recorded correctly by Eggeling].
 C. 21, 3. —ἐκείνους for ἐκείνους M [so T].
 C. 25, 1. —τε after τὰ omitted [recorded by Eggeling].
 C. 27, 2. —'ἐλάμβανε CLM'—ἐλάμβανεν.
 C. 29, 3. —τινα—ἐπαναβάντας.
 C. 32, 1. —σφίσι before ξυμμάχους omitted [recorded by Eggeling].
 'κωλύουσιν BLM'—M has κωλύωσι, with C.
 C. 33, 3. —'ἐπέσχοντο BGLM'—ἐπέσχον τὸ M, while T has ἐπέσχον, τὸ, (sic); hence correct Stahl's note (*edit. ster.* ii. p. xxi.) 'ἐπέσχοντο codd. emend. Dobree.'
 C. 34, 5. —ὑπὸ Κορινθίων, omitting τῶν.
 C. 36, 6. —'λμμένα νακρούσεως'—M has λμμένα κρούσεως with ACE [incorrectly recorded by Eggeling].
 C. 37, 2. —οὔτε for οἱ τε.
 C. 38, 2. —οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι for οἱ δὲ M [so T].
 3. —διαλιπούσας for pres. [recorded by Eggeling].
 C. 41, 1. —διὰ τῶν ὀλκαδων δελφινόφοροι, omitting 28 words.

C. 42, 2.—πολλὴν πανταχόσε, for παν. πολλήν.

C. 43, 1.—ἀδύνατον with CLG.

5.—τὸ before παρατείχισμα [so T].

6.—τὲ inserted before ἐκ τῶν.

C. 44, 3.—ἀναβεβήκει—ἀνεβεβήκει.

7.—αὐτοῖς for αὐτοῖς.

C. 47, 1.—κατορθοῦντας—κατορθοῦντες.

3.—ἐπελθοῦσι for ἐπελθούσαις.

C. 49, 2.—τὰς τῶν πολεμίων.

C. 52, 2.—ἐξάγοντα (not ἐπεξάγοντα, as Stahl).

C. 53, 1.—Συρακοσίων for πολεμίων.

—παρεβοήθη for -ει.

C. 54.—οἱ inserted before Συρακόσιοι, with AEF G.

C. 57, 4.—Κεῖοι Ἀνδριοι, om. καὶ.

11.—Ἰωνίω.

C. 58, 2.—μεραῖοι for Ἱμεραῖοι.

4.—τοὺς ἄλλους Συρακοσίους, for τοὺς ἄλλους Συρακόσιοι.

C. 64, 1.—ἡμῶν C; ἡμῶν BL; om. M' [and so Eggeling]—M has ἡμῶν.

—πλευσονμένους c. CM Hu.—M πλευσο- μένους [Eggeling also wrong].

2.—τι after τις omitted.

C. 70, 2.—οἱ ἄλλοι om. unus B'—M omits οἱ ἄλλοι.

C. 71, 7.—πεπόνθεσαν—ἐπεπόνθεσαν.

C. 72, 1.—ἀπολωμένων for ἀπολομένων.

3.—ἀναχωρήσαντες for ἀναχωρήσοντας.

C. 74, 1.—ὡς CM.; M has ὡς.

C. 81, 4.—ῆ inserted before ξυνετάσσετο.

C. 83, 2.—μέχρι οὐ δ' ἄν.

C. 86, 2.—Ὁν ἐς τὰς λιθοτομίας, 'in M foeda est rasura.' The text is injured by damp, but a late hand has written συρακόσας in the lacuna caused by the partial disappearance of λιθοτομίας.

I have compared the version of the seventh book contained in M with the version which it gives of the second, and find the text somewhat better in the seventh: there are fewer omissions and fewer stupidities. But on the whole, if I have reported the readings correctly, I think it must be admitted that Stahl was misled when he set so high a value on the MS.

E. C. MARCHANT.

THE TWO ISLANDS CALLED IKAROS.

IN the Sabbaitic fragment of Apollodorus (*Rhein. Mus.* xlv. p. 168) the following account is given of the reason (or one of the alternative reasons) for the anger of Artemis and her demand for the sacrifice of Iphigeneia: ἔλεγε γὰρ (sc. ὁ Κάλχας) μνηῖσαι Ἀγαμέμνονι τὴν θεόν, κατὰ μὲν τινὰς ἐπεὶ κατὰ θήραν ἐν Ἰκαρίῳ βαλὼν ἔλαφον εἶπεν οὐ δύνασθαι σωτηρίας αὐτὴν τυχεῖν οὐδ' Ἀρτέμιδος θελοῦσης. The Vatican fragment (p. 64 Wagner) has only διὰ τὸ μνηῖναι τὴν θεὸν τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι ὅτι [τε] βαλὼν ἔλαφον εἶπεν 'οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀρτεμις.' Tzetzes, *ad Lyc.* 183 (he reproduces another edition of the same handbook), says ἐξελθὼν Μενέλαος ἡ Ἀγαμέμνων ἐπὶ κινήγειον καὶ τρώσας ἔλαφον μεγαλαυχῆσας ἐφθέγγετο οὕτως 'οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀρτεμις.' Proclus in his so-called hypothesis of the *Kypria*, which, as Bethe (*Hermes* xxvi. p. 593) has, it appears to me, conclusively shown, is no such thing, but an excerpt from another edition of this famous handbook, writes Ἀγαμέμνων ἐπὶ θήρας βαλὼν ἔλαφον ὑπερβάλλειν ἐφῆσε καὶ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν. All these three latter versions (the Vatican Apollodorus, Tzetzes, and Proclus) make no mention of the buck being the property of Artemis, one of her holy beasts; and Agamemnon's impiety lies solely in his boast that he was a better shot

than Artemis. This version, I should say with confidence, has no worth at all, and owes its genesis merely to a misinterpretation of the phrase 'οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀρτεμις.' This misinterpretation may be very old, for even Sophocles (*Electra* 569) with his ἔπος τι τυγχάνει βαλὼν seems to shirk the question of what Agamemnon's boastful words were, and Hyginus' authority (*Hyg. Fab.* 98 superbis in Dianam est locutus) does the same; but neither in Sophocles nor in Hyginus (θεῶς παίζων κατ' ἄλσος—cervam ejus) nor even in Sch. ad Hom. *Il.* A 108, of which more anon, do we find the deliberate modification of the story by the suppression of one important part of it—Artemis' ownership of the buck—which we encounter in the Vatican Apollodorus, Tzetzes, and Proclus. This suppression is doubtless due to one of the editors of the handbook.

The interpretation of the ἔπος τι given in the Sabbaitic Apollodorus is unquestionably the right one, since it alone accords with the very vital fact that the buck was the holy buck of Artemis. This has been rightly pointed out by Wagner in his article dealing with the Sabbaitic Apollodorus (*Rhein. Mus.* xlv. p. 398), but he has failed to see that the designation of locality

ἐν Ἰκαρίῳ here amounts to a statement that the buck *was* the holy beast of Artemis, and therefore confirms very materially the better authority of this Sabbaitic Apollodorus. Wagner will be readily excused by all scholars for his ignorance that the locality of the Attic deme of Ikaria is now no longer doubtful (the publication of Reinach's *Chroniques d'Orient* with its indices (Paris, 1891) will do much to prevent such oversights), but he should have borne the Island of Ikaria (or Ikaros) in mind. According to the version of the story given by the complete handbook, this was the second sojourn of the fleet at Aulis (in the Sabbaitic fragment it is the first and only sojourn, but this is obviously due to untimely compression by the editor), and it is at least probable that not only the Teuthranian war, but a sojourn in the Archipelago had intervened between the two visits to Aulis; so that the presence of Agamemnon in Nicaria (to give the island its modern name) need not surprise us. When Tzetzes says that it was Μενέλαος ἢ Ἀγαμέμνων who killed the buck, we remember that there were two versions of the intervention of the Delian Anius and his daughters the Oenotropi: according to one (Pherecydes *ap. Sch. ad Lycophr.*, and Tzetzes, *ibid.* 570), the whole Grecian host landed in Delos, and Anius tried to persuade them (with what success we cannot tell) to remain there for nine years; according to the other, *Menelaus* and Ulysses on their return from Cyprus called at Delos (Simonides *ap. Sch. ad. Od.* ζ 164: see Wagner *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca*, p. 185). The Vatican Apollodorus, as Wagner shows, reproduces the latter form, and we may be pretty sure that the slaughter of the buck in Ikaria by Menelaus and not by Agamemnon was part of this version or a concession to its exigencies. That we should read in the Sabbaitic fragment Ἰκάριον (cp. the variants in Strabo xvi. p. 766), there can be little doubt. There was in this island a temple of Artemis Ταυροπόλος (Strabo xiv. p. 639) and to this temple there must have been attached a precinct in which sacred deer were preserved; for when Alexander's admirals came across an island in the Persian Gulf with a goddess who owned a sacred deer-park, they, whose thoughts were ever in the distant Aegean their home, called this island Ἰκαρος or Ἰκαρία 'ἐπὶ τμητῇ τῆς νήσου τῆς Ἰκάρον τῆς ἐν τῷ Αἰγαίῳ πόντι' (Arrian *Anab.* vii. 20, 3), and gave to the goddess of the

place the familiar name of Ἀρτεμὶς Ταυροπόλος (Strabo xvi. p. 766 καὶ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος ἄγιον* ('Ενάγρον *vel sim.*!) ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ μαντεῖον <τῆς> Ταυροπόλου. Dion. Per. 610 Ἰκαρον εἰναλίην, ὅθι Ταυροπόλοιο θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.). There is no reason to believe that the natives of the place welcomed and adopted the strange Greek goddess, but when Nicaria became an 'eremonesi' to which the Samians sent over their flocks (see Strabo),¹ its name-child out of ken in the Persian Gulf was the only Ἰκαρος recognised in the society of the learned. It looks very much as if Aelian in his description of this, to him, mythical island (*De Nat. An.* xi. 9) was reproducing a Latin source, for his mention of hares seems to be due to a false comprehension of the Latin 'leporarium' (see Varro iii. 3 and 12, quoted by Clermont-Ganneau *Imagerie Phénicienne*, p. 82); but while it is certain that nothing in his account is of any value for the island in the Persian Gulf and oriental religion, it is quite possible that something of that which he and Arrian tell us of the usages at this place may be taken to apply to the sanctuary of Artemis in the Ikaria of the Aegean. That goats as well as deer were reared here there can be little doubt. Both Arrian and Aelian mention goats in Ikaros of the Persian Gulf, and we find in *Schol. ad Hom.* A 108 the following remarkable variant of the Agamemnon story: δὲ τὸ φονεύσαι αὐτὸν τὴν ἱερὰν αἶγα τὴν τρεφομένην ἐν τῷ ἄλσει αὐτῆς.

In saying what I have said, I fear that I may, from a desire to be as precise as possible, have conveyed the impression that I had formed a general judgment as to the respective value of the two new fragments of Apollodorus—so strangely restored to us almost at one and the same time; but of course I have not. This is a very difficult question, which no one will be at liberty to discuss before the appearance of the synoptical edition of both promised us by Wagner.

W. R. PATON.

¹ It would seem from Strabo's words (p. 639), that the island was in his time even more sparsely populated than at the present day. The modern Nicariots are nearly all of them charcoal-burners, and show considerable enterprise, combining together to rent forests in Asia Minor, and establishing themselves there until they have converted them into charcoal. This, of course, involves their being usually absent from home, and agriculture suffers, just as it does in Carpathos, where nearly all the men, and not a few of the unmarried women, are stone-masons, travelling in troops all over Greece and the Archipelago in search of work.

MR. BAYFIELD ON CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

As I expect that Mr. Bayfield's late article will call forth answers from others interested in the questions he raises, I will be as brief as the case admits.

1. *Conditional Sentences.* The main objection to my mind against the proposed abolition of the implication of a negative in certain Conditional Sentences is the insufficiency of what Mr. Bayfield proposes to put in its place. In the *Class. Rev.* for May 1890 he says that the hypothetical statement is merely put *less positively*: does he mean that when there is no *ἂν* in the apodosis the Indicative of the protasis puts the hypothetical statement positively at all? I thought it was now generally admitted that no conditional sentence implies fact. In his *Ion* (1889), note on line 354, he says 'The Imperfects present the contingency less immediately, less directly and vividly than the Presents, but that is all.' These phrases have to me, I confess, little meaning, unless indeed I read into them a meaning similar to that which Mr. Bayfield's opponents maintain. The term 'vivid,' which is so hard worked now-a-days in various connexions¹, seems here specially inappropriate; for if the opposite of 'vivid' is 'vague,' then 'If I had had the money, I should have given it' is not less but more vivid than 'If I had the money, I gave it': for the former sentence expresses the conditional idea of the latter and something more. I have therefore an even stronger objection to 'vivid' in this connexion than I had (*Class. Rev.* June, 1887) and still have to Goodwin's use of it in Future Conditions, where he distinguishes three degrees of vividness.²

Mr. Bayfield cites the authority of Kühner; but it must not be supposed that Kühner agrees with Mr. Bayfield's main contention that no negative is implied. On

¹ Cf. Prof. Jebb on Soph. *Trach.* 76 ἀρ' οἶσθα δὴτ', ὦ τέκνον, ὡς ἔλειπέ μοι μαντεῖα πιστά etc.—'ἔλειπε seems to differ from ἔλειπε here only as being somewhat more vivid.'

² My contention that εἰ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἁμαρτάνοι ἂν implies 'I do not say that he will do so'—a proviso against being misunderstood to imply 'he will do so'—is confirmed by all my subsequent reading. I am sorry to see that Goodwin in his new edition maintains a classification according to time, by which the relation of ἂν with the optative to other apodoses with ἂν is obscured. There is an obvious analogy between all sentences in which the apodosis speaks of what would be: and there is no difficulty in classifying on this basis (both in Greek and in Latin) if the implication 'I do not say he will' is admitted.

the contrary Kühner here agrees entirely with the other view; the passage quoted is merely an attempt to explain the *origin* of the usage, which he says was 'gewissermassen symbolisch' (§ 571. 2. ii.). Whether Kühner's explanation is the right one is a matter of opinion: to me it seems hazardous to attempt to draw a line between what is expressed by a form of speech and what the hearer inevitably infers from the expression.

Of course the form of the protasis taken by itself does not imply non-fulfilment (εἰ εἴχες 'if you had'); for the sentence might go on εἰδίδους 'you used to give.' But when the sentence goes on εἰδίδους ἂν, then the if-clause assumes a different character; the past tenses of the Indicative, instead of denoting what *was*, come to denote what *is not*—a curious use of tenses to express a modal signification, but one familiar enough in other languages of our family: in Latin, English, German, and Spanish there is also a modal shift to the Subjunctive, but not in Greek or French. So completely does the principal clause with ἂν lend its colour by association to the if-clause that the former may be entirely suppressed, and yet the if-clause may retain its implication of unreality, e.g. *Ion* 960 f.

IIP. τλήμων σὺ τόλμης: ὁ δὲ θεὸς μᾶλλον σέθεν.

KP. εἰ παῖδά γ' εἶδες χεῖρας ἐκτείνοντά μοι.

'Yes indeed (you would have said so) if you had seen the child stretching out its arms to me.' In answer, then, to Mr. Bayfield's question in what part of the sentence the implication of a negative lies, I answer in the *if-clause itself when combined with a principal clause containing ἂν*: such a clause as εἰ ἐποίησε may mean two things: (i) if he was doing it, (ii) if he *were* doing it (as he is not). Which of these two meanings is suggested to the hearer depends on the principal clause. If the principal clause follows the if-clause, the mind of the hearer is in suspense till he reaches it.

I agree with Mr. Bayfield that our pupils are apt to misunderstand our best meant and most happily worded explanations (though not specially in this connexion); but would it fare better with a teacher who tried to bring home the point by means of 'vividness'? More might be said in favour of leaving out all explanations and simply telling pupils to be guided by the form of

the sentence in English; though difficulties would arise in sentences in which *were* is used for *would be*, *had done* for *would have done* and sentences like 'he could work, if he tried.' And we should perhaps be after all only training our pupils to do correct sentences without developing their understanding of meanings. If pupils knew English thoroughly we might simply say to them 'use the same mood in Latin as you find in the English'¹; but they never can learn English thoroughly without an appeal to meanings.

But though I think that the implication of a direct negative lies in the large majority of sentences of the class in question, I am not bound to say that it lies in all. Language (especially the Greek language) is not such a hard and fast thing: the same form of speech often has more than one meaning, and conversely one and the same meaning is often expressed by several different forms. Clearly the implication of a negative does not lie in all apodoses (see Goodwin's excellent § 412, and Mr. Caskie Harrison in the *Class. Rev.* July 1890). Again there are sentences of the type of Shakspeare's 'If it *were* so, it was a grievous fault' in which *were* refers not to present but to past time and cannot imply more than 'I do not say that it was so,' and the apodosis does not speak of what *would be*. I have given instances in my *Latin Gram.* § 501 and note on *Rudens* 1021. If so, may not the same kind of implication and no more occasionally lie in the if-clause of sentences whose apodosis does speak of what *would be*? Hor. *Sat.* I. 3. 4 f. (*si peteret, non proficeret* and *si collibuisset, citaret*) seems to me, according to my present lights, to be of this kind. Mr. Bayfield has a strong case against interpreting *peteret* and *collibuisset* in their ordinary senses—a stronger case, I think, than he has in 'Even a Stoic would have jumped, if a wasp had stung his nose.'²

2. *Indefinite Clauses.* I think I can answer Mr. Bayfield's challenge: he demands an instance of *ὅστις ἂν ᾄδῃ* in the sense 'whosoever is singing at this moment.' Is not this the meaning of the expression *ὅστις ἂν ᾄδῃ* 'whosoever he is (may be)', i.e. at the time in question? The meaning at any

time would often be quite out of place: e.g. in Theognis, 963 f. (Bergk, ii. p. 544):—

Μή ποτ' ἐπαινήσῃς, πρὶν ἂν εἰδῇς ἄνδρα σαφηνέως,
Ὅργην καὶ ῥυθμὸν καὶ τρόπον ὅστις ἂν ᾄδῃ.

In such passages as Herod. ix. 93 (τὰς ἂν αὐτὸς ἔλῃται καὶ δικαιοῦ), vi. 139 (δικαιοῦσι Cobet), the meaning is *prospective*: ('who hereafter,' not 'who at any time'). And not merely ἂν but also ποτέ can denote indefiniteness other than temporal; *ὅστις ἂν ᾄδῃ* is precisely equivalent to *ὅστις ποτ' ἔστι*, e.g. Ζεὺς, ὅστις ποτ' ἔστιν, etc. (*Agam.* 160).

But no doubt, as Mr. Bayfield says, a far commoner meaning of *ὅστις ἂν ᾄδῃ* is 'whoever sings at any time.' Nor is this in any way surprising. From the nature of the case this meaning will be found far more frequently in clauses of this kind than the other; and 'sings' is a meaning of the Present tense which is quite as legitimate and common as 'is singing.'

That the Greeks should have consistently maintained a difference between *ὅστις ἄδει* and *ὅστις ἂν (ὅς ἂν) ᾄδῃ* seems to me a priori unlikely. For this distinction of meaning between 'whoever (whether rich or poor, old or young, etc.) sings' and 'who at any time sings' is a fine one, and in the large majority of cases it disappears altogether.³ For 'whoever' (= 'any one who') generally implies at any time, and 'who at any time' generally, if not always, implies any one who; the antecedent can hardly be particular. The word *whoever* is itself a compound of *who* and the temporal adverb *ever*. Thus it comes about that in sentences like ἐμοὶ γὰρ ὅστις πᾶσαν εὐθύνων πόλιν | μὴ τῶν ἀρίστων ἄπτεται βουλευμάτων. . . κάκιστος εἶναι νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι δοκεῖ (*Soph. Antig.* 178—181) and πορεύονται γὰρ αἱ ἀγέλαι ᾗ ἂν αὐτὰς εὐθύνωσιν οἱ νομεῖς (*Xen. Cyr.* i. 1. 2) the meaning is the same: 'whoever does not cleave (i.e. at any time),' 'where (i.e. in any direction in which) they at any time drive.'⁴ 'Ever-clauses' of the past are usually expressed by the Optative; to πᾶς ποιητὴς γίγνεται οὐ

³ The absolute vanishing point is reached in the case of temporal relatives: 'when at any time' is necessarily identical with 'at any time when.'

⁴ Cf. Thuc. iv. 92: οὐ γὰρ τὸ προμηθεὺς οἷς ἂν ἄλλος ἐπὶ ὁμοίως ἐνδέχεται λογισμέναι καὶ ὅστις τὰ μὲν ἑαυτοῦ ἔχει, etc. That Mr. Bayfield is over subtle in his treatment of *Od.* xiv. 156 (*Class. Rev.* 1890, p. 203):

Ἐχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Ἀἰδῶο πόλῃσιν
Γίγνεται, ὅς περὶ εἰκὼν ἀπατήλια βάσει
seems to me to be proved by the parallel passage *Il.* ix. 312:

Ἐχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κείνος ὁμῶς Ἀἰδῶο πόλῃσιν,
Ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ.

¹ In such a sentence as 'he would if he could' the *would* is historically a subjunctive just as much as the *could*; so too in 'he would write' where *would* is an auxiliary.

² It should be always borne in mind that language is an imperfect instrument for the expression of thought; we are often driven to employ forms of speech which express more than we intend.

ἀν ἔπος ἀφηται (Plat. *Symp.* 196 E) corresponds οὐδ' αὖτο Μίδας ἐγγίγντο χρυσός. Here too the burden of proof rests with Mr. Bayfield that the meaning is always 'what at any time' as distinct from 'anything which.'

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

1. Although it is true that in so-called 'unfulfilled' conditional sentences the condition is unfulfilled in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, yet there is the hundredth case, and this is enough to show that this form does not of itself imply non-fulfilment of the condition. It is possible even to put into this form a sentence in which it is assumed that the condition is fulfilled. Suppose a man on his trial for some crime. The prosecuting counsel might very well say, 'The argument of the other side is that the innocence of the prisoner is shown by his having stayed at home, but I say that *if he had been guilty* (as I maintain he is) he would have acted in the same way.' Or again, a man might say, 'The prisoner if he was (had been) innocent would have stayed at home, if he was (had been) guilty would have run away. Let us now see what he actually did,' and so argue back to his guilt or innocence. Here both of the assumptions are purely argumentative. This seems to be good sense and good English and would, I apprehend, be correctly rendered in Greek by εἰ with the aor. followed by the aor. with ἄν. Comp. Thuc. vi. 31 εἰ γὰρ τις ἐλογίσατο τὴν τε τῆς πόλεως ἀνάλωσιν κ.τ.λ.... πολλὰ ἂν τάλαντα εὐρέθη ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τὰ πάντα ἐξαγόμενα. There is here no implication that no one made the calculation.

2. I think that logically these sentences are nothing but what Goodwin calls 'vague future,' what others call 'ideal' conditional sentences put into past time, and that they are in their nature purely hypothetical, e.g. εἰ τις τοῦτο ἐποίησεν δίκην ἂν ἔδωκε is equivalent to εἰ τις τοῦτο ποιῶν δίκην ἂν δίδοι put into past time without any necessary implication of τις having done the act or not having done it. In most of the rare cases in which the context shows that the condition is not to be regarded as unfulfilled it may be observed that the protasis has εἰ τις or εἰ τι, and naturally, for it is easier to deny of a particular person or thing than of every person or thing. The unreality of the apodosis carries with it the unreality of the protasis, but the unreality of the protasis is only evidence, and not proof, of the unreality of the apodosis, except, as Goodwin points out § 412, 'in the rare cases in which the

unreal condition is the only one under which the action of the apodosis could have taken place.'

3. Next, I think that the majority of potential indicatives, in which we have the aor. with ἄν, can be looked upon as apodoses with a protasis beginning with εἰ τις or εἰ τι. No doubt in many of them there is no condition to be thought of, but in many others one can readily be supplied and the ἄν is more easily explained when that addition is made. Thus in Thuc. vi. 31 above the apodosis alone might have stood very well as a potential indic. but it happens that the protasis is supplied. It is strange that Goodwin, who in his new edition devotes considerable space to the potential indic. (though I cannot find it noticed in the previous edition), does not remark that if a protasis is supplied to a potential indic. that protasis is not to be considered as unfulfilled.

4. Further, this view appears to me to offer an explanation of the 'iterative' use of ἄν with the imperf. and aor. which has hitherto appeared an isolated use. Perhaps I may be allowed to refer to my paper on this subject in *Cl. Rev.* III. 343. This use is often found without a protasis expressed, but I will take an example in which we have a protasis. Thus in Thuc. vii. 71 εἰ μὲν τινες ἰδοῖν πη τοὺς σφετέρους ἐπικρατοῦντας, ἀνελήσιν τε ἂν καὶ κ.τ.λ. the protasis is the same as in a 'past general' conditional sentence, and as that form of sentence (being really temporal and not conditional, as Mr. Bayfield has well pointed out) implies that the circumstances supposed did occur sometimes, the imperf. or aor. with ἄν can be used in a frequentative sense. This is much more easily understood when it is once seen that the aor. with ἄν in the apodosis of an ordinary 'unfulfilled' conditional sentence does not *per se* imply non-fulfilment of the protasis.

5. What then about teaching? On the whole I do not think any change from Goodwin's classification should be made. It is admittedly correct to say that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the condition is unfulfilled, and the hundredth can take care of itself. Moreover even there in turning the sentence into Greek a boy is safe in putting εἰ aor....aor. ἄν when he finds....had....would (should) have....in the English. Accordingly I consider this discussion a purely academical one. At any rate Prof. Goodwin's mercies are more tender than Mr. Bayfield's. The latter, in order to simplify matters (?), arrives at the luminous conclusion that ἄν is used 'when the hypothetical statement is

presented less positively.' Who can make head or tail of this? How is 'if he had done it' less positive than 'if he did it'?

6. With regard to what Mr. Bayfield calls 'indefinite' sentences (I prefer Goodwin's name of 'general') I cannot agree with him that in these sentences $\delta\varsigma \alpha\upsilon$ means 'who...at any time' and not 'whoever.' I think it means rather 'whoever...at any time,' for in all conditional relative sentences, whether general or particular, both $\delta\varsigma$ and $\delta\varsigma \alpha\upsilon$ = whoever, the antecedent being indefinite. It appears to me that $\delta\varsigma \alpha\upsilon \alpha\delta\eta$ can have two meanings (1) whoever is singing at any time (2) whoever shall sing, according as we have in the apodosis a present or a future tense. Conditional relative sentences follow the construction of conditional sentences, $\delta\varsigma \alpha\upsilon$ being equivalent to $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu$ τις. If a present tense follows it is a 'present general,' if a future it is a 'vivid future.' In the latter it is immaterial to the form of the sentence whether a time is specified or not. Take e.g.

Eur. Med. 787 $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\pi\epsilon\rho \lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\iota\theta\eta\chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota | \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \theta' \delta\varsigma \alpha\upsilon \theta\acute{\iota}\gamma\eta \kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\varsigma$. Does Mr. Bayfield maintain that if 'tomorrow' were added to the last line the form must be changed? In English 'at any time' and so I presume $\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon$ in Greek may mean either (1) at various times or (2) once, but at some time unspecified, and it has this latter meaning when it occurs in particular sentences. Thus Homer *Il.* A 166 $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\rho \eta\gamma \pi\omicron\tau\epsilon \delta\alpha\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha\iota | \sigma\omicron\iota \tau\acute{\omicron} \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu \mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu$ Goodwin takes as an example of a 'present general,' Monro in the first edition of his *Homeric Grammar* as an example of a particular case in the future, but in the second edition he agrees with Goodwin in considering it general and would read $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ for $\eta\gamma$. The reason of this is no doubt because it is followed not by a future but by a present tense like all 'present general' sentences, and implies that the event spoken of (the distribution of spoil) takes place at any rate sometimes.

R. C. SEATON.

$\delta\sigma\tau\varsigma \alpha\delta\epsilon\iota$)($\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon \alpha\delta\eta$.

The statement of Mr. Bayfield on page 92 concerning the proper rendering of $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\delta\epsilon\iota$ seems somewhat misleading. Does he wish to convey that the converse of his dictum is also true and that the only correct rendering of $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\delta\epsilon\iota$ is 'whosoever is singing at the present moment'? This would seem to be a reasonable inference from his general argument. Such a conclusion however would be altogether unwarrantable, as may be proved abundantly from Attic writers. To me it seems there is a large element of truth in the view he impugns as well as in his own; in fact $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\delta\epsilon\iota$ and $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon \alpha\delta\eta$ are very often undistinguishable in their English dress. Both may be often rendered correctly by the same expression: 'whosoever sings.' This is clear from the following passages taken exclusively from Attic writers.

Euripid. *Andromache* 419—20.
 $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \delta' \alpha\upsilon\tau' \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma \acute{\omega}\nu \psi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ (whosoever blames)

$\eta\rho\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\iota \delta\upsilon\sigma\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{\omega}\nu \delta' \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$.

Euripid. *Hec.* 375.

$\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \omicron\kappa \epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega \theta\epsilon \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$.

Aeschyl. *Pers.* 600.

$\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma \kappa\upsilon\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}$,
every one who is well versed in misfortune (Paley).

Andokid. *Myst.* 35.

$\acute{\omega}\nu \delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \beta\omicron\upsilon\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota, \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\tilde{\omega} \acute{\epsilon}\mu\tilde{\omega} \lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omega$
 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\xi}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ (whosoever wishes).

Eurip. *Erechth.* Fr.

$\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\alpha\varsigma \delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\omega}\varsigma \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.

Antiphon, *Tetral.* F. 2.

$\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\gamma \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\mu\omega\varsigma \tau\iota\upsilon\alpha \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$
 $\dots \acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\epsilon}\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \sigma\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota \delta\epsilon \tau\acute{\alpha}$
 $\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\iota\mu\alpha$ (whosoever slays).

$\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon$.

Antiphon, *Herodas* 92.

$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \mu\eta\gamma \tau\eta\gamma \acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\gamma \gamma\epsilon \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota, \delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon$
 $\alpha\upsilon \tau\eta \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\gamma \acute{\alpha}\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$
 $\tau\eta \psi\acute{\eta}\phi\omega$ (whosoever slays).

Isocr. *Soph.* 10.

$\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\varsigma \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\eta\alpha\varsigma \omicron\chi \omicron\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\lambda\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$
 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\varsigma\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \omicron\acute{\iota}\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma \alpha\upsilon$,
 $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\omicron\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\eta, \tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau' \acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu \delta\upsilon\nu\eta$
 $\theta\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$ (all those who are able).

Eurip. *Ion* 440—41.

$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon \beta\rho\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$
 $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \pi\epsilon\phi\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\eta \zeta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \omicron\acute{\iota} \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}$.

The passages from Antiphon illustrate admirably my contention that the force of $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ and $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon$ is frequently identical. In these sentences, whilst words and meaning in the two relative clauses are clearly the

same, the form differs, *ὅστις* occurring in the one and *ὅστις ἄν* in the other. It would be obviously absurd to translate the first of these clauses according to Mr. Bayfield's rule 'whosoever of the present company is lawlessly slaying any one...is guilty of impiety towards the Gods'...If murder was being committed before the audience, the speaker would scarcely content himself with mild denunciation of this kind. In only

one of the above passages is the definite-time meaning at all applicable; in the quotation from Andokides we may render *ὅν ὅστις βούλεται* 'whosoever of these men is at the present moment willing,' but it is the *context* that tells us. The other examples go to prove the indefinite force of *ὅστις* as well as of *ὅστις ἄν* at least in affirmative clauses in Attic Greek.

J. D.

THE CORSINI MS. OF THE *CULEX*.

[As Prof. Postgate has called attention (and well he may) to the Corsini MS. of the *Culex* discovered by me in 1887,—a MS. whose readings are completely ignored by Prof. Leo in his recent edition of the poem,—it seems advisable no longer to defer the publication of its readings as a whole. For a description of the MS. and a discussion of some of its variants I may refer to my article in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* for 1887, pp. 153—156. I do not scruple to repeat, what is there implied, that no edition of the *Culex* which neglects this codex can be considered to represent the MS. tradition adequately.

In copying out my collation of the Corsini MS. I notice that some of its readings have not been recorded. These are however few and generally not important.

ROBINSON ELLIS.]

3 sint carmina docta. 5 Noticieque ducum. 6 eris. 10 dignato poliantur. 11 aurea prolis. 13 recinente lira. 15 asterie parnasia. 17 sonas liquida. 20 ad quam uentura recurrit Agrestum bona fetura sit cura tenentis. 22 nemorum cultus. 23 cultrice uagos astra. 24 chartis. 27 ponitque canit. 30 Vritur hic thomas oriens. 32 Leta meo. 34 uenientis. 35 Mollia sed tenui pede currere carmina uersu. 36 apta gaudet. 37 memorabili et. 44 fugabat (not fugarat). 47 Lurida qua patulas. 51 Scrupea desertas herebant ad caua rupes. 53 arbuta raris marg. ramis. 55 qua nascitur. 57 Imminet intuici (?) perstantis imaginis undam. 60 Omnia luxuriæ prætus incognita curis. 62 fuerint bis lota. 64 Sub laqueare domos. 65 nec fulgor in ulna. 67 Alconi referent boetique. 68 Conche abacha a pectore. 71 Vere notat dulcis. 72 recin-

ente. 73 inuidia degentem fraude remota. 75 Imolia. 77 et uallibus intus. 78 nobis. 81 agnouit. 83 dum scadeum fulgentibus ornet marg. puto seadeo. 84 transcendit. 87 pancheia rura. 88 herbas uariantibus addunt. 90 huic imminet omnis. 91

Derigit huc sensus. 92 Quolibet ut requiem uictu contentus habundet. 93 licet. 96 poeta. 99 nondum non arte canora. 100 Compacta solidum. 103 Qua iacet oceanus. 105 repetebant. 112 et cede eruenta. 114

natis ac morte futurum. 116 chorus. 117 coetum tantum non horridus. 118 ripis silisque. 119 Quam te pernigre morantem.

120 natura doraum. 122 dulci ^{domum} l'feras. 124 platanus inter quas lucos. 128 Ambusto pheton. 129 amplexu. 130 tentis. 132 lamentandi mala perfida. 133 et nunc defende puellis. 134 comitabant. 136 triptolomi aristas. 137 argo e navi decus addita pinus. 138 Proceratus decorat siluas hirsuta partus. 139 Appetit montibus. 140 species et. 141 manent. 142 frateruero non plagat nec populus ictum. 143 Ipsaque ²accedunt. 145 non ascia. 147 post uarios. 148 superat. 149 sonat orta. 150 quanquam geminas obstrepet. 151 Hac querule. 152 alit aeris echo om. 153 ardore cicadis. 154 passum fesse cubuere. 155 Excelsisque supra dumis quae leniter adflans. 156 susurratis. 160 pressus somno. 161 quietem. 163 ide. 165 sub sideris estu. 166 Obuia uibrati carpens celt. om. 168 Tollebant aure uenientis ad omnia uisus. 170 et se. 171 caput cui crista. 173 Aspectuque micat fl. lumine toruo. 176 intendere et ouia torua. 177 infringere. 178 computat. 179 Ardet et mente. 180 euexis orbes. 182 per tractum.

¹ Perhaps a corruption of *fetas*.

² Was this from an original *succedunt*?

183 continet alumnus. 184 Et mortem uitam remouet. 185 diducta gemmas. 186 Hac se moris erat natura pupula telo. 187 Iacta. 189 sensus dum torua. 190 quo minus unde. 191 Impiger exanimi uix campos. 192 Et ualidum dextra detraxit ab arbore truncum. 193 Qui sociaret. 194 uoluit tales. 197 cristam. 198 tardus omni langore. 199 Nescius aspiciens timor obcecauerat. 200 Oe minus. 201 Iam quatit et biugis oriens erebois et quon non. 204 undis. 207 Languidaque effuso requiem dare membra soporem. 210 Quid inquit meritis ad quem delatus. 214 tetrus. 215 transnare. 216 uidi et flagrantia thedis. 217 Lumina collucent infestis omnia templis. 218 compta. 224 loetium. 226 et iure. 229 sit pena merenti. 230 Pena sit exitium modo sit dum grata uoluntas. 231 Aui cim merios. 233 pena. 234 sed et othon. 235 Deuinctus mestus. 236 Conati quondam cum sint inscendere. 237 tuas iras. 238 alitica. 240 ultimus annus. 243 Qui saxum procul auerso qui monte reuoluit. 244 Contempsisse dolor quem numina uincit acerbam. 245 Ocia querentem frustra sub lite puelle. 246 erinis. 247 cōubia mortis. 248 super agmine turmas. 249 tu cordam conduda. 250 sollicitus. 251 pandionias miseranda. 252 uoxit inedytin quod. 254 Ad discordantes cadmeo sermone. 256 iam aduersatus uterque. 258 Heu mutandus ramquam aufero. 259 nomina. 260 Elysiam¹ tranandus agor delatus ad undam. 261 heroia surget. 262 Aduersas preferre. 264 calcedonis² adameti cura morata est. 265 in artis. 266 concepta. 268 Qui recessit. 269 Pena queres pectus orpheus. 270 cerbero numquam. 272 furens. 273 obtentu. 274 Nec fossasque domos. 275 facilem ditis sine iudice sedes. 276 uitam post mortem uindicat actam. 277 ualens. 278 steterant omnes. 279 in sidera orphei. 280 mouera alte. 281 humo steterant amnes. 282 rapiebat. 283 Labentis biuges lune. 287 non fas marg. nefas. 292 crudelis credulis magis orpheus. 294 noscent. 295 graves non sede. 296 Vos manet. 299 iunxit amorem. 300 Hunc rapuit illum ferit ast illum. 301 Adsidet hac sociat de. 302 Alte in

excisum ignis. 303 turba³ ferit arte refulsos. 304 tali diuortia bellis. 305 troia grai. 307 sigeaque preter. 308 seui ducis. 309 Videre in classes. 310 ne te signes. 311⁴ Ipsas uagit nanque id apotens feritatis ab ipsa. 314⁵ lacrimante. 316 Obiectaque. 318 Fluminibus ueluti fragor et libet in se. 319 Tegminibus telisque super sigeaque preter. 320 Eriperet reditus. 322 honores. 324 Hectora lustrauit uictor de corpore troiam. 325 quod letat' huius. 326 Arma doli sithaca. 327 Huic gerit euersos. 328 trimonii resi. 329 iam letanter ouans rursusque tremescit. 330 Iam ciconas⁶ lestrigone cett. om. 331 succincta molosis. 331 illum et uerida caribdis. 332 squallida. 333 gener ante prolis atride. 335 repente. 336 Doris erictonias portauit funditus⁷ aras. 337 grauius pena tibi troias⁸ uenti. 337 Reddiebit. 338 Helespontiacis. 340 Nec quicquam. 341 Iret in euectus. 342 telo deus. 343 Vis argoa appetens patriam deditaque predam. 344 Arcise rethonie secundis. 345 ad undas. 346⁹ parsim flexis super ieta carinis. 347 Cum ceu seu. 351 Corripere et soles. 352 Aruere in terras hic modo¹⁰ letam. 353 circumdat anxia. 354 Immoraturque et sidera capheren. 355 egeaque tela. 356 Littora perempta. 357 Omnis in equoreo fluit atia naufrage luctu. 358 sident pariles. 359 omnes. 360 Omnis suscipit. 361 Hic fabii hic decique hic est oratia uirtus. 362 nunquam moritura camilli. 364 Deuotum bellis consumpsit gurgis in unda. 365 Mutius. 366 Cui cessit lidithime facta. 367 Hic cutius. 368 Flaminus. 369 Iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores 370 Scipiatosque. 371 Menia romanis cartaginis. 372 ego ditis opacas. 373 uiduos a. 374 quo maxima. 375 discernit. 376 Ergo¹¹ quam clausam mortis iam dicere. 377 cogunt ab iudice pena. 378 ne conscius adsis. 379 Sed tolerabilibus curis hec immemor audis. 380 Et tamen ut¹² uadis

³ *trepidante?*

⁴ Perhaps

Ipsa sudis namque Ida parens feritatis et ipsa.

⁵ Perhaps *flammaque cremante.*

⁶ Read *atrox Laestrygone limen*, 'threshold the Laestrygon made cruel.'

⁷ So I think rather than *arcis*, but it is difficult to be quite certain.

⁸ Cors. is here nearer the truth than the other MSS. which have *troia furenti*. The right reading is *Troia ruenti* (Bembo).

⁹ i.e. *sparsim*, rightly as against the other MSS. which give *pars inflexis*.

¹⁰ i.e. *laetans* (*J. of Philology*, xvi. p. 155).

¹¹ Perhaps

Ergo QVOM causam mortis, QVOM dicere uitae.

¹² My conjecture, *Ut tamen audieris, dimittes omnia*

¹ Perhaps Elysium tranamus: agor delatus ad undam.

² Hence I would restore

quod sacra mariti

In Chalcedoniis Admeti causa morata est. 'Alcestis, for whom Admetus' cruel disease arrested its course.' The *a* of *causa* seems to have been transferred to *admeti*, making *adameti*. Then *causa* was changed to *cura*.

dimitteres omnia. 381 fontem. 382 virides.
383 Et mea. 386 remeigentem. 390 preter.
393 Gramineam uiridi foderet. 397 leni

formans. 398 achanto. 399 crescent
pudibunda ruborem. 400 Et uirole omne
genus hic est et pastica mirtus. 401

Atque aciⁿ thos (sic). 402 decus surgens
hic rododaphine. 403 roris non auia cura
marini. 404 thuris opes piscis imitata sa-
bina. 405 Chrisantusque. 406 bochus
hic amaranthus. 407 Humastusque
pinus. 408 Non illic narcisus abest cui.

409 proprios exarsit in armis. 411 Hic
tumulus super infertur. 412 firmat quod
littera. 414 redit.

P. VIRGILII MARONIS. CVLIX. EXPLICIT.

P. VIRGILII MARONIS. AETNA. INCIPIT.

ADDENDA.

The additions which follow have been
obtained by a re-collation of the MS. :—

227 Iusticie prior. 241 Restat. 246 ac-
cendit. 271 Credidit aut. 312 Ida faces
altrix cupidis prebebat alumnis.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

TWO EARLY LISTS OF ST. CYPRIAN'S WORKS.

I.—In the well-known life of St. Cyprian by his deacon Pontius occurs an enumeration of his chief literary productions, the full bearings of which do not seem to have been ever yet recognised. Pontius puts the case (§ 7 : ed. Hartel p. xcvi.) that Cyprian instead of retiring from his see into a voluntary exile during the persecution of Decius had been martyred then rather than under Valerian eight years later :

‘Finge enim tunc illum martyrii dignatione translatus. quis emolumentum gratiae per fidem proficientis ostenderet? quis virgines ad congruentem pudicitiae disciplinam et habitum sanctimonia dignum velut frenis quibusdam lectionis dominicae coereret? quis doceret paenitentiam lapsos, veritatem haereticos, schismaticos unitatem, filios dei pacem et evangelicae precis legem? per quem gentiles blasphemi percussus in se quae nobis ingerunt vincerentur? a quo christiani mollioris affectus circa amissionem suorum aut, quod magis est, fidei parvioris consolarentur spe futurorum? unde sic misericordiam, unde patientiam disceremus? quis livorem de venenata invidiae malignitate venientem dulcedine remedii salutaris inhiheret? quis martyres tantos exhortatione divini sermonis erigeret? quis denique tot confessores frontium notarum secunda inscriptione signatos et ad exemplum martyrii superstites reservatos incentivo tubae caelestis animaret?’

Of the identity of most of the references there has been, and can be no reasonable doubt. I take the results as given by the latest writer on the subject, K. Goetz

uentis, seems to find support in this reading of Corsini. See *J. of Philology*, u.s. p. 156.

¹ I would read *adornans*.

NO. LI. VOL. VI.

Geschichte der Cyprianischen Litteratur (Basel 1891) : ad Donatum, de habitu virginum, de lapsis, de unitate ecclesiae, de dominica oratione, ad Demetrianum, de mortalitate, de opere et eleemosynis, de bono patientiae, de zelo et livore, ad Fortunatum de exhortatione martyrii, de laude martyrii. The sixth and the last of these identifications are the only ones on which a doubt might be raised. Under ‘retorting on the heathen the charges they brought against the Christians,’ Professor Sanday (*Studia Biblica* iii. 275) has proposed to see a reference to the Quod idola dii non sint; but I do not doubt that Goetz is right with the ad Demetrianum. On the other hand the de laude martyrii, which indeed is put forward with less confidence, cannot be allowed to figure in the list. Certainly it is quoted as Cyprianic by Lucifer of Cagliari in the fourth century, and about the same time obtains a place in the Cheltenham list. Nor can one doubt that some real connection with Cyprian enabled it to secure this position : Dr. Sanday says of it (*l.c.* p. 279) that it ‘appears to be African in its origin,’ and allusions in ch. 8, 14 to the great plague ‘aut non cotidiana cernimus funera,’ ‘inter cruenta morborum populantium strage’ etc. fix it as contemporary with Cyprian’s episcopate. But the Biblical text employed differs decidedly from that of Cyprian, whose quotations are remarkably consistent with themselves; and even apart from the general evidence of style, this would be enough to justify the editors in relegating the piece to the appendix. And if so, while it is intelligible that it should have crept into the Cyprianic collection during the century which inter-

vened before Lucifer, it is scarcely conceivable that it should have imposed upon the friend and biographer of the Karthaginian prelate. It is less easy to say what one would propose to put in its place as satisfying the last sentence of Pontius. If a single document is referred to, the claims of Ep. 58, a letter to the people of Thibaris exhorting them to steadfastness under renewed trial, would be considerable; compare especially in § 9, 'muniatur frons ut signum dei incolome servetur' with the rather curious phrase in Pontius. If a group of documents can on this occasion be postulated, the series of letters 10, 28, 37, 11, 38, 39 (perhaps also 58) which deal with one common subject of confession and martyrdom, and especially with a fresh recrudescence of persecution (cf. 38. 1), are found together not only in the MSS. but in the Cheltenham list, and may well have been put together into connection before Pontius wrote.

Pontius' references being now, except in the case of his final clause, established beyond cavil, it is natural to ask whether any, and if so what, principle underlies, first, the omissions which the list shows when compared to the first volume of Hartel's edition, and, secondly, the order in which the books mentioned are arranged. Putting aside the last sentence eleven works are summarized, including all Cyprian's treatises with the exception of the *Quod idola dii non sint* and the *Testimonia ad Quirinum*; and when it is remembered that both of these are independently placed by critics in the earliest period after Cyprian's conversion, and before the Decian persecution, and that on the other hand Pontius is mentioning only those books written later on in his episcopate, it might seem that their omission in this list is not only explicable but unavoidable.¹ No presumption against the genuineness of either could then be drawn from their non-appearance. To the other

question Goetz supplies a very probable answer when he suggests that the order of the treatises mentioned is the actual order of their composition. From Cyprian's own correspondence (Ep. liv. 4, lxxiii. 26) we know that the *de lapsis* and *de unitate ecclesiae* belong to the time immediately succeeding his return to Karthage in A.D. 251, and the *de bono patientiae* to the much later controversy about re-baptism in A.D. 256. From Pontius again we learn (*Vita* § 9) that the *de opere et eleemosynis* was read to the Karthaginian community in the intermediate period of the great plague (A.D. 252 onwards). References to current events place the treatise on the Lord's Prayer in the year next after the Decian persecution, and connect that to Demetrianus and that on the Mortality with the plague. Internal evidence compels us to range the *ad Donatum* near the commencement of Cyprian's literary activity, and the *de zelo et livore* in close connection with the tract on Patience at its end. To summarize these results, if we compare the order of Pontius with the order adopted for instance by Archbishop Benson in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, we shall find that the two lists are with two or three exceptions identical. Archbishop Benson makes the *Testimonia* follow the *ad Donatum* and *de habitu virginum*, while if our explanation of Pontius' omission of the *Testimonia* is correct, it should certainly precede them, and they must be postponed to the period of his exile or return. In the second place Pontius puts the *ad Demetrianum* immediately before instead of immediately after the group of writings connected with the plague. Lastly the *ad Fortunatum* appears in the *Vita* as the very last of the eleven identified treatises, instead of three places higher up. Perhaps the following table will make these points clearer:

PONTIUS, *Vita*, § 7.

1. *ad Donatum*.
2. *de habitu virginum*.
3. *de lapsis*.
4. *de unitate ecclesiae*.
5. *de dominica oratione*.
6. *ad Demetrianum*.
7. *de mortalitate*.
8. *de opere et eleemosynis*.
9. *de bono patientiae*.
10. *de zelo et livore*.
11. *ad Fortunatum*.

Dict. Chr. Biogr. i. 739 ff.

- [*quod idola dii non sint*].
ad Donatum.
de habitu virginum.
 [testimonia *ad Quirinum*].
de lapsis.
de unitate ecclesiae.
ad Demetrianum.
de mortalitate.
de opere et eleemosynis.
ad Fortunatum.
de dominica oratione.
de bono patientiae.
de zelo et livore.

¹ But an alternative explanation is possible; see below.

Of these differences, internal evidence favours the position which Pontius assigns to the treatise on the Lord's Prayer, while in the other cases there is nothing to decide one way or the other: but the credit of the list is by this time, I think, sufficiently shown to warrant us in following it in doubtful cases. So far then we seem to have in Pontius a contemporary and chronological collection of the chief portion of St Cyprian's more formal writings.

But another question follows: Is this correct order supplied us by Pontius out of his own personal knowledge, or does he borrow it from an already published edition, so to speak, of his master's works? It would be impossible to settle this on *a priori* grounds: but it is surely decisive that the order of Pontius is substantially the common order of the best MSS. from which as from a standard they diverge in one direction or another. Any one who will compare the tables drawn up by Professor Sanday (*l.c.* p. 283) will at once be struck with the force of this. The MQ family (eighth century) differ only in inverting the *de ecclesiae unitate* and *de dominica oratione*; but against this Pontius is supported by the great majority. The oldest MS. (S saec. vi.) together with two Oxford MSS. (O₄ O₅) postpone no. 6 (*ad Demetrianum*) after nos. 7 and 8; and the Vatican MS. T and O₃ and the Paris MS. H inverts 7 and 8 as well; but in all other points these six MSS. follow Pontius.¹ To put it another way, of thirteen arrangements in the MSS. which Dr. Sanday records—omitting that of the Cheltenham list—six give the first five treatises in exactly the Pontian order, and four more with only one divergence; seven give the group connected with one plague, nos. 6, 7, 8, in the same place as Pontius, although only one gives them in the same order; six give the final group of three in the Pontian place and order without variation.

Now of course this extent of agreement between the *Vita* and the MSS. cannot be fortuitous. Nor does it seem possible that the MSS., or rather their archetypes, copied their order from this allusive passage in the *Life*. The only tenable hypothesis which

adequately explains the facts appears to me to be that when Pontius wrote, the treatises of St. Cyprian had already been collected in their present order, and that Pontius being accustomed to read them in that order naturally followed it when he summarized their contents. And there is nothing improbable in this idea of an official collection of the treatises in the years immediately following St. Cyprian's martyrdom; on the contrary so great was his reputation among his contemporaries that it would be likely in itself that demand should have arisen for a complete edition of his chief writings, and likely also that such an edition if put together in Karthage by those acquainted with his history should contain them in the chronological order of their composition. It is also conceivable that the *Testimonia*, both on account of its character as a mere compilation of Biblical quotations and still more on account of its length—it is more than half the length of the rest of the treatises combined—was omitted from this collection and circulated like the letters or groups of letters separately, or as an appendix to the treatises. But it must be admitted that the absence of the *Testimonia* and of the *Quod idola* from the head of the lists in the MSS. forms a serious objection to the *prima facie* explanation already put forward to account for their omission by Pontius. It will now seem equally possible that Pontius enumerated all the collected works, though it still remains open to us to hold that as a matter of fact the two omitted treatises were the earliest.

One interesting result follows if the hypothesis of a collected edition as early as A.D. 260 or 270 here developed is substantiated; for it implies that the codex had already begun to supersede the roll as the method of book-publication, since no roll would have contained all or anything like all of the works enumerated by Pontius. This change from papyrus to vellum was in progress between the early part of the third and the middle of the fourth century, for while Origen's library at Caesarea was formed of papyrus it was restored about A.D. 350 by two successive bishops of Caesarea in vellum. But Dr. Sanday (*l.c.* p. 233) has shown that at least in Africa the movement was in full operation by the end of the third century, for the Bibles and sacred books confiscated during Diocletian's persecution were not rolls but codices. The preceding investigation has established some presumption that in Karthage at any rate the change had been anticipated a generation

¹ It ought to be noted here that by an oversight in Dr. Sanday's lists, the *ad Demetrianum* is incorrectly omitted for O₄ O₅, and both the *ad Demetrianum* and *de bono patientiae* for S: and also that though the *de zelo et livore* is not now extant in S, yet since the end of no. 9 (*de bono patientiae*) and commencement of no. 11 (*ad Fortunatum*) are both also wanting, it is not impossible that the lost gatherings may have contained no. 10 as well.

before Diocletian, and that side by side with the Bible the works of a writer ranked so highly by his contemporaries as was St. Cyprian were already being transcribed upon the vellum codex.

II.—The story of Mommsen's discovery, in a 10th century MS. (C) of various chronicles, then in the Philipps Library at Cheltenham (No. 12266) but now in Berlin, of three lists of books, firstly of the Old, secondly of the New Testament, and thirdly of St. Cyprian—in close proximity to which were found two notes of time equivalent respectively to A.D. 359 and A.D. 365—need not be repeated here. The lists have been fully discussed, after Mommsen, by Professor Sanday in the paper already referred to, published in the third volume of *Studia Biblica*, and in an appendix to the same paper contributed by myself. But the chronicles

contained in the MS. have been in the course of the last year published by Mommsen in a valuable contribution to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* under the title of *Chronica Minora saec. iv. v. vi. vii.*, and from his edition it appeared that in the library of St. Gall there existed a sister MS. a century older than the Cheltenham one. Dr. Hort communicated this information to Dr. Sanday, and in consequence I visited the St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek in September 1891, and was able through the courtesy of the authorities to make a collation of the Biblical and Cyprianic lists. Since my return I have learnt that a collation has been already published by Mommsen himself in *Hermes*, vol. xxv. p. 636: I confine myself therefore to the Cyprianic list which I print in full according to the St. Gall MS. 133, p. 488 (G) :

ci
Indiculum caeli cypriani.

(1) ad donatum	ccccx		
(2) ad uirgines	d		(lege dl or de)
(3) de lapsis	decelxxx		
(4) de opere et helimosine	declxx		(lege delxx with c)
(5) ad demetrianum	dxxxv		(lege dexcxxv)
(6) de ecclesiae unitate	dce		
(7) de zelo et linore	ccccxx		
(8) de mortalitate	dl		
(9) de patientia	d		(lege de)
(10) ad fortunatum	decelx		
(11) de domini oratione	decel ¹		(lege decexl)
(12) ad quirinum libri iiii	dl		
ii	decel		
iii	declxx		(lege Mdeclxx)
(13) ad antonium	del	[Ep. 55]	
(14) de calicae dominico	cecel	[Ep. 63]	
(15) de laude martyrum	deccxxx		
(16) ad confessione martirum	cxl	[Ep. 10]	
(17) monsi et maximo	lxx	[Ep. 28]	
(18) ad eosdem alia	cxx	[Ep. 37]	
(19) de precando deum	cxc	[Ep. 11]	
(20) ad clero	liiii		
(21) aurilio lectore pre ¹ ordinatione.	cxi	[Ep. 38]	
(22) celerino	e	[Ep. 39]	
(23) ad iabaianum	dl	[Ep. 73]	
(24) ad quintum	e	[Ep. 71]	
(25) ad ephesius ? xiii	xxx		
(26) ad ephesius ?	cxx	[Ep. 70]	
(27) sententiae episcoporum	dxx		
(28) ad pompeium	cecx	[Ep. 74]	
(29) ad stephanum	c	[Ep. 72 ?]	
(30) ad fidem	cvi	[Ep. 64]	
(31) ad magnum	clxxx ²	[Ep. 69, part 10]	(lege cclxxx[iiii] with c)
(32) de marziale	cecl	[Ep. 67]	
(33) luci et egratium	xl	[Epp. 2, 78]	(lege {ad eueratium xl luci 1?}
(34) felici et ceteris	xx	[Ep. 79]	
(35) de numedia conf	xxx	[Ep. 40]	
(36) ad florentium	cevi	[Ep. 66]	
(37) ad presbit	lxxii	[Ep. 54]	
(38) ad eosdem et diae	xxx ³	[Ep. 32]	(lege xxv with c)

¹ Possibly *pro m. i.*

² Possibly clxxxiii.

³ This and the next line are added by a second hand at the foot of the page.

(39) ad clerum urbis	lxx	[Ep. 20	
(40) roman res	cccxv	[Ep. 30 Romanorum rescriptum	(lege ccxv with c)
(41) adversus iud	ccxc		
(42-49) ad cornilium viii	∞ eviii		
(50) uita cipriani	de		
fiunt om̄ uersi 'H XVIII d			

Our two MSS., G and C, share mistakes together and therefore descend from an archetype some way off the original; but they are independent of one another, and there are cases where each in turn preserves or approaches nearer to the true reading.

The St. Gall MS. in three cases verifies conjectures of my own as to the cyphers for the treatises, giving 880 instead of 980 for the *de lapsis*, 860 instead of 740 for the *ad Fortunatum*, and 950 instead of 850 for the second book of the *Testimonia*. The raising of the *de unitate* from 700 to 750 is also a gain; and the figures for the *de patientia* and *de dominica oratione* if not yet quite correct are much nearer the truth than those in the other MS. But again the figures of the Cheltenham MS. are preferable for No. 4 (670 for 770), No. 31 (284 for 180 or 184), No. 38 (25 for 30), No. 40 (215 for 315). Finally the St. Gall MS. has not nine but eight letters to Cornelius; and this is doubtless right since, although it is true that there are actually nine letters extant, only eight are grouped together in any of the MSS. and only eight were known to St. Jerome who mentions the number in his *Chronicle*. We also find instead of the un-

intelligible *adeprb* with which the Cheltenham MS. heads Nos. 25, 26, the scarcely more hopeful-looking *ad ephesius*,² but it is not difficult to discover latent here the words we want—*ad episcopos*; I suppose the central letters had become blurred or illegible in the archetype, but that *ep* at any rate was still visible at the commencement.

For the detailed proof which establishes the locality and date of this list as African of the fourth century, and in especial for the arguments in support of the identification of the various Cyprianic letters named in it with letters of the extant collection, I must be content to refer again to the essay and appendix in *Studia Biblica*. My only object in relation to it on the present occasion has been to incorporate the evidence of a second MS., the *variae lectiones* of which have not (to the best of my knowledge) been discussed yet elsewhere.

C. H. TURNER.

² Mommsen gives for No. 25 *ad efesius*, altered by the first hand to *ad ephesius*; for No. 26 *ad efhesius*. He is probably right as to the scribe's having made an alteration: but I think the scribe's first idea must have been *efesius* or *effesius*, and his second *ephesius*, in both cases.

APELT'S PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN TREATISES.

(Continued from p. 162.)

DE XENOPHANE.

In the beginning of the section of the treatise in which Xenophanes is criticised occurs a passage (179, 12 *sqq.*) where the argument appears somewhat disordered. Two portions of it 977^a 24—27, and 977^a 27—33 seem rather alternative versions than members of the same train of reasoning.

977^a 23, εἰ δ' ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς ἀπάντων κράτιστον, ἔνα φησὶν αὐτὸν προσήκειν εἶναι.

(A). 977^a 24—27, εἰ γὰρ δύο ἢ ἔτι πλείους εἶεν οὐκ ἂν ἐπὶ κράτιστον καὶ βέλτιστον αὐτὸν εἶναι πάντων. ἕκαστος γὰρ ὢν θεὸς τῶν πολλῶν ὁμοίως ἂν τοιοῦτος εἴη.

(B). 977^a 27—33, τοῦτο γὰρ θεὸν καὶ θεοῦ

δύναμιν εἶναι, κρατεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ κρατεῖσθαι, καὶ πάντων κράτιστον εἶναι. ὥστε καθὼ μὴ κρείττων, κατὰ τοσοῦτον οὐκ εἶναι θεόν. πλείωνων οὖν ὄντων, εἰ μὲν εἶεν τὰ μὲν ἀλλήλων κρείττους, τὰ δὲ ἡττους, οὐκ ἂν εἶναι θεοὺς· πεφυκέναι γὰρ τὸ θεῖον μὴ κρατεῖσθαι. ἴσων δὲ ὄντων, οὐκ ἂν ἔχειν θεῶν φύσιν, <θεὸν γὰρ τὴν φύσιν> δεῖν εἶναι κράτιστον, τὸ δὲ ἴσον οὔτε βέλτιον οὔτε χείρον εἶναι τοῦ ἴσου.

(C). 977^a 34—36. ὥστε εἴπερ εἴη τε καὶ τοιοῦτον εἴη θεός, ἔνα μόνον εἶναι τὸν θεόν. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ πάντα δύνασθαι ἂν ἂ βούλοιτο. οὐ γὰρ ἂν δύνασθαι πλείωνων ὄντων ἔνα ἄρα εἶναι μόνον.

The argument of A is as follows—'If God is supreme, there must be only one God; for if there were several, each of them, as God, would equally have the prerogative (of supremacy) and so none of them could be supreme.'

The argument of B is—'God (α) must be superior to all and (β) never inferior. So far as inferior (μὴ κρείττων) he is not God. Suppose then there were several gods. (i.) Either they would be (unequal etc.) superior to one another in some things and inferior in others: and thus they could not be gods, because, by hypothesis, God cannot be in any sense inferior. Or (ii.) they would be equal and then none of them can be supreme.'

B thus supersedes A because what appears as the sole case in A (equality of gods) is only one of two alternatives in B, and the treatment of this alternative in B is the same as that in A. Again, A argues simply from the premiss that God is the best and most powerful in comparison with all else (κράτιστον καὶ βέλτιστον); whereas B adds to this premiss another, viz. that God must be inferior in no respect to anything else (μὴ κρατεῖσθαι ὥστε καθὼ μὴ κρείττων κ.τ.λ.). This addition is necessary to meet the alternative not contemplated in A that each of a plurality of gods might be *κράτιστος* in some respect but *μὴ κρείττων* in some others.

If the whole is by the same author it is difficult to believe that he can have intended these two versions of the argument to stand together. One might imagine that the second occurred to him after writing the first, and that though some mark was made to show the first was cancelled it was reproduced in subsequent copies, or it may be supposed that a marginal variant by another hand may have got into the text. The passage also which follows (C=977^a 34—36) is such as to suggest that the text may have been tampered with. The first sentence of it is a fitting conclusion to the argument and may well belong to B. But what follows disturbs the logical sequence (οὐδὲ γάρ.) If a sentence at the end of an argument expressing its result preceded by an illative particle like ὥστε is followed by a sentence connected with it by γάρ (οὐδὲ γάρ), the latter ought to be a proper epitome of the reasons already given. But here the clause οὐδὲ γάρ κ.τ.λ. is either a new departure with a somewhat different reason (οὐ πάντα δύνασθαι ἂν τὸν θεὸν ἂ βούλοιο) and lamely treated in comparison with the preceding compact and clear argu-

ment in B; or, at most, an imperfect and entirely superfluous repetition of the reasoning in A.

There is this additional awkwardness in C that we have first the conclusion of the previous argument, *ἕνα μόνον εἶναι τὸν θεόν*, then a reason given for it, then the conclusion itself repeated, *ἕνα ἄρα εἶναι μόνον*, in the compass of little more than three lines. This could not be defended by an appeal to the mannerism of repetition noticed in 975^b 35 (see above): for that is quite different and merely consists in objecting that a certain conclusion cannot be drawn from a certain premiss, and then adding, what is implied but not expressed in the objection, that the person criticised did make such an inference.

In the text above given *ἔχειν θεῶν φύσιν* has been substituted for *ἔχειν θεὸν φύσιν*, the MSS. reading. Bonitz read *θεοῦ φύσιν* and filled up the obvious lacuna between *φύσιν* and *δεῖν* thus—*οὐκ ἂν ἔχων θεοῦ φύσιν <οὐδένα> τὸν μὲν γὰρ θεὸν τὴν φύσιν > δεῖν εἶναι κράτιστον*.

182. 5, 977^b 38, *θέλοι δ' ἂν οὐδεὶς οὕτω τὸν θεὸν φάναι κράτιστον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἔχει ὡς οἷόν τε ἄριστα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐλλείπει καὶ εὖ καὶ καλῶς ἔχειν αὐτῷ: ἅμα γὰρ ἴσως ἔχοντι καὶ κείνο ἂν συμβαίνει*. The editor notes 'οὕτως Brandis forte recte, καλῶς Mullach,' but reads as above. The text can hardly stand. Perhaps οὕτως should be inserted after ἴσως.

183. 6, 978^a 20, *ἐτι δὲ σφαιροειδῆ ὄντα ἀνάγκη πέρας ἔχειν: ἔσχατα γὰρ ἔχει, εἴπερ μέσον ἔχει, ἃ τούτου πλείστον ἀπέχει*. This is the editor's reading. His note is: 'αὐτοῦ τοῦ πλείστον ἀπέχει Lps. αὐτοῦ τοῦ πλείστον ἀπέχων R^a vulgo, ἃ αὐτοῦ τοῦ μέσον πλείστον ἀπέχει correctura in Isengrim. mrg.' The editor's *ἃ* seems right but it seems probable that the original was *ἃ αὐτοῦ τούτου πλείστον ἀπέχει*. This with the exception of the inserted *ἃ* is probably the reading represented by Lps., for *οὐ* probably is a mistake for *τοῦ*=*τούτου*: cf. Gardthausen *Gr. Pal.* p. 257.

183. 13, *τό τε γὰρ οὐκ ἂν οὐδεὶς νῦν αἰσθάνεται, καὶ ἂν δέ τις οὐκ ἂν αἰσθάνοιτο νῦν*. If the text is right *ὄν* stands for *ὄν τι*, for it cannot here be equivalent to *τὸ ὄν*. Perhaps however it would be better to read *τι* for *τις* (cf. below 978^a 31, *τῶν ὄντων τι*). The subject of *αἰσθάνοιτο* would then be *τις* got from *οὐδεὶς* according to a known idiom.

184. 4, 978^a 32 sqq. The text here seems to have undergone considerable corruption. It is partly a criticism directed against the principle maintained by Xenophanes that Being could not have any predicate common

with Not-being. He had argued that since Not-Being was *ἄπειρον*, Being could not be *ἄπειρον*; and since Not-Being was *ἀκίνητον*, Being could not be *ἀκίνητον*. The present passage attacks the first of these deductions, and in the immediately preceding context it is pointed out that there were obviously predicates common to Being and Not-Being (τί κωλύει ἔνια ταῦτα λεχθῆναι κατὰ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ μὴ ὄντος): for instance τὸ μὴ ὄν is οὐ λευκόν, but it does not follow that all ὄντα are λευκά, on the contrary there are ὄντα which have the same predicate (οὐδὲν κωλύει τῶν ὄντων τι μὴ εἶναι λευκόν). On this follows the passage before us:—

οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄλλην οὖν ἀπόφασιν δέξονται τὸ ἄπειρον, εἰ μὴ τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν τί (Lips.; λεχθέντι εἴ τι μᾶλλον περὶ τὸ ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν ἐστὶν ἅπαν. ὥστε καὶ τὸ ὄν ἢ ἄπειρον ἢ πέρασ ἔχον ἐστίν.

According to the editor, who treats of the passage in his Prolegomena, Brandis emended οὕτω δὲ κατ' ἄλλην οὖν ἀπόφασιν δέξονται τὸ ἄπειρον, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῷ πάλαι λεχθέντι εἴ τι μᾶλλον περὶ τὸ ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν ἐστὶν ἅπαν and rendered 'sic igitur jam perspicuum est, Deum esse infinitum posse, ne in auxilium quidem vocato antiquissimo illo praecepto: omnia aut habent aliquid aut non habent.' The editor rightly objects, among other things, that in Peripatetic writings τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν cannot be 'antiquissimum praeceptum' but refers to something said a little above in the same treatise, and also that the words so emended cannot express what Brandis wants. He follows Brandis in reading κατ' ἄλλην for καὶ ἄλλην, and suppresses μὴ before the first ἔχειν. He supposes that ἄλλην ἀπόφασιν means the negations formed with a privative as opposed to those with οὐ (a distinction which, it is true, is found about twenty-five lines lower down in the text) and refers τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν to 978^a 17 sqq.—εἴπερ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἄπειρον ὃ ἂν μὴ ἔχη πέρασ δεκτικὸν ὄν πέρατος..... ὥστε εἰ μὴ ἔχει πέρασ μέγεθος ὄν, ἄπειρόν ἐστιν, 'ex his enim patet, τὸ ἄπειρον magis de affirmantibus (παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν) quam de negantibus (παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν) praedicari.' He would therefore alter ἅπαν to ἄπειρον, and read!—οὕτω δὲ κατ' ἄλλην οὖν ἀπό-

φασιν δέξεται <τὸ ὄν> τὸ ἄπειρον, εἰ, κατὰ τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν, τί μᾶλλον παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν ἐστὶν ἄπειρον. ὥστε καὶ τὸ ὄν ἢ ἄπειρον ἢ πέρασ ἔχον ἐστίν. This is ingenious and perhaps to some extent confirmed by some words in a similar argument below about τὸ ἀκίνητον—978^b 20, τὸ δὲ ἀκίνητον τῷ ἔχειν πως ἤδη λέγεσθαι. But the context seems to offer insuperable difficulties. According to the editor's reading of the text there would be two arguments directed against Xenophanes' position that τὸ ὄν cannot be ἄπειρον because τὸ μὴ ὄν is ἄπειρον and τὸ ὄν and τὸ μὴ ὄν cannot have common predicates. The first (971^a 26—32, τί γὰρ κωλύει ἔνια ταῦτα λεχθῆναι κατὰ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ μὴ ὄντος κ.τ.λ.) is that τὸ ὄν and τὸ μὴ ὄν can have the same (negative) predicates: the second (978^a 32 sqq., the emended passage) would be that ἄπειρον cannot be predicated of a mere negation like τὸ μὴ ὄν at all but is a predicate of what is positive i.e. of ὄν.

If this were so the second argument would be somewhat obscurely expressed. There is a similar difficulty in the concluding words of the supposed second argument. ὥστε καὶ ought either to introduce a case analogous to one already given or mark the transition from a universal to a particular included under it; but it would obviously here do neither of these things. The gravest objection however and one which seems to have been somehow quite overlooked, is that the sense which the emended passage would have to bear is exactly that which is well and clearly stated and put as a new consideration in the words which immediately follow—ἴσως δὲ ἄτοπον καὶ τὸ προσάπτειν τῷ μὴ ὄντι ἀπειρίαν, οὐ γὰρ πάν εἰ μὴ ἔχει πέρασ, ἄπειρον λέγομεν, ὥστε οὐδ' ἄνισον οὐδ' ἂν φαίμεν εἶναι τὸ μὴ ὄν.

This seems enough to make the emendation extremely improbable, but there are some other difficulties. τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν ought to be a statement that ἄπειρον is predicated of positive notions, but the passage which the editor supposes referred to rather implies than expresses this in defining the ἄπειρον as that which being receptive of limit has no limit. It is of course something that it is implied; but contrast the clearness of the passages where it is really intended to put this point, e.g. the one last quoted (ἄτοπον καὶ τὸ προσάπτειν τῷ μὴ ὄντι ἀπειρίαν) and below 978^b 18 τὸ μὲν (sc. τὸ μὴ κινεῖσθαι) ἀπόφασιν τοῦ κινεῖσθαι, ὥστε τὸ μὴ ἴσον, ὅπερ καὶ κατὰ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰπεῖν ἀληθές, τὸ δὲ ἀκίνητον τῷ ἔχειν πως ἤδη λέγεσθαι, ὥστε τὸ ἄνισον. In fact the

¹ The whole passage with Apelt's emendations would be as follows:—

οὐδὲν, οἶμαι, κωλύει καὶ τῶν ὄντων τι μὴ εἶναι λευκόν. οὕτω δὲ κατ' ἄλλην οὖν ἀπόφασιν δέξεται τὸ ὄν τὸ ἄπειρον, εἰ, κατὰ τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν, τί μᾶλλον παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν ἐστὶν ἄπειρον. ὥστε καὶ τὸ ὄν ἢ ἄπειρον ἢ πέρασ ἔχον ἐστίν.

ἴσως δὲ ἄτοπον καὶ τὸ προσάπτειν τῷ μὴ ὄντι ἀπειρίαν, οὐ γὰρ πάν, εἰ μὴ ἔχει πέρασ, ἄπειρον λέγομεν, ὥστε οὐδ' ἄνισον οὐδ' ἂν φαίμεν εἶναι τὸ μὴ ὄν.

meaning assigned to the emended passage would have to be got by help of passages which follow it rather than of anything preceding it.

Again, it is very doubtful whether εἶναι παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν μᾶλλον ἢ μὴ ἔχειν could possibly mean 'to be predicated of (or used with etc.) affirmative rather than negative notions' or anything equivalent to it. ἔχειν could hardly stand alone with such a meaning, it would require an adverb, e.g. ἔχειν πως, as below in 978^b 20; nor does there seem to be any usage of παρὰ which would suit the supposed sense.

The indefinite pronoun τι would not only be in an awkward position (τι μᾶλλον) but it is hard to see how it could be construed at all in agreement with the editor's view.

Without hoping to discover a satisfactory emendation of the text one may make some suggestions as to the probable sense of the original based upon the preceding and following context. The preceding context makes it likely that the MSS. reading οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἀπόφασιν is sound and that for the next words δέξονται τὸ ἄπειρον should be read δέξεται καὶ τὸ ἄπειρον. The writer wishing to prove that ἄπειρον can be predicated of τὸ ὄν contends that τὸ ὄν can have negative predicates, e.g. τὸ μὴ λευκόν. It would be natural for him to go on to apply this to the predication of ἄπειρον, and this would be done by οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἀπόφασιν δέξεται καὶ τὸ ἄπειρον—'There is nothing to prevent τὸ ὄν from having such a negative predicate as μὴ λευκόν, and so also of course it admits of other negative predicates and among them τὸ ἄπειρον.' ἄλλην ἀπόφασιν could also be interpreted as the editor takes it—'another kind of negation' i.e. with a privative, though this seems less likely.

δέξονται may have arisen from the nominative ὄν being written above the text, as Apelt also has suggested.

On the other hand an argument may be drawn from the sentence which follows the emended passage—ὥστε καὶ τὸ ὄν ἢ ἄπειρον ἢ πέρας ἔχον ἐστίν. This, as already remarked, looks like the application to a particular case of a general principle which had just been stated, and therefore confirms ἅπαν in the preceding sentence which the editor would emend to ἄπειρον. Secondly as this conclusion (ὥστε καὶ κ.τ.λ.) has the form of an alternative, it is likely that the principle of which it is a particular case was a statement of alternatives, and thus it is likely that ἢ in the preceding (ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν) is the ἢ of an alternative—'or'—and

not that of comparison—'than'—as the editor takes it. Lastly, as it is probable that τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἢ ἔχειν corresponds to a general form of which ἢ ἄπειρον (= μὴ ἔχον πέρας) ἢ πέρας ἔχον is a particular case, probably τὸ μὴ ἔχον ἢ ἔχον τι should be read.

This with the alteration of μᾶλλον to ἄλλο and the omission for the moment of τὸ πάσαι λεχθέν would lead to the following—οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ὄν ἀπόφασιν δέξεται <καὶ> τὸ ἄπειρον, εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχον ἢ ἔχον τί ἐστιν ἅπαν, ὥστε καὶ τὸ ὄν ἢ ἄπειρον ἢ πέρας ἔχον ἐστίν. 'And so also Being will admit of other negative predicates, and among them ἄπειρον, if it is true of everything that it either must have or not have a given predicate, so that Being also must either have limit or not have limit and be ἄπειρον.' This would be an appeal to the principle of contradiction. 'Everything must be A or not A, and so Being must be either limited or not limited (and it is assumed not to be limited therefore it is unlimited).' This suits the context well because the preceding argument, to which this would be attached, is the contention that the same kind of negative predicates may be given to Being and Not-Being, e.g. μὴ λευκόν, and so it is implied that ἄπειρον though a negative=μὴ πέρας ἔχον, and, as such, supposed (by Xenophanes) to be a predicate of Not-Being, is also a possible predicate of Being. This would then admit the hypothesis of Xenophanes that ἄπειρον as negation of πέρας ἔχον applies to Not-Being. And then the argument in the next passage (ἴσως δὲ ἄτοπον καὶ τὸ προσάπτειν τῷ μὴ ὄντι ἀπειρίαν κ.τ.λ.) would very properly follow, being a denial of the hypothesis previously admitted and pointing out that ἄπειρον (as not merely μὴ πέρας ἔχον) is not a true predicate of Not-Being at all.

This view of the two steps of the argument is somewhat confirmed by the parallel argument about the ἀκίνητον. Just as Xenophanes contended that Being could not be ἄπειρον because πέρας μὴ ἔχειν (= ἄπειρον εἶναι) was predicated of Not-Being, so also he contended that Being could not be ἀκίνητον because μὴ κινεῖσθαι (= ἀκίνητον εἶναι) was predicated of Not-Being. The answer to this has two steps. In the first place the identification of μὴ κινεῖσθαι with ἀκίνητον εἶναι is not called into question, but it is argued that μὴ κινεῖσθαι need not be refused to Being because it is a predicate of Not-Being (978^b 27, cf. 978^b 16). In the second place the identification of ἀκίνητον εἶναι with μὴ κινεῖσθαι is declared to be fallacious.

In the latter passage the words *ἄλλως τε καὶ ἀπόφασις ἢ τὸ λεχθέν* would correspond to οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄλλην οὖν ἀπόφασιν δέξεται κ.τ.λ.

A serious objection to the view here proposed is the reference τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν, because it is not likely that the principle of contradiction would be thus described unless it had been used in the preceding context, and this application of the principle of contradiction to the present subject has not been made before in the treatise. But it does not seem unreasonable to conjecture that τὸ πάλαι λεχθέν may be an interpolation, partly because the presence of these words in the text makes the position of the indefinite pronoun *τι* very awkward, a difficulty which vanishes if they are removed; and partly because the sense proposed for the rest of the passage seems to suit the context so well.

The words may have been interpolated or added in the margin because the passage was erroneously supposed to be to the same effect as 978^a 17 above.

184. 7, 978^a 35, ἴσως δὲ ἀτοπον τὸ καὶ προσάπτειν τῷ μὴ ὄντι ἀπειρίαν. This is the reading of Lips. It seems better to omit τό with other MSS. or to read καὶ τό.

184. 10, 978^a 38, εἰ <τί> οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι ὁ θεὸς πέρας εἰς ἂν, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς θεόν; εἰ δ' ἐν μόνον ἐστίν, ὁ θεὸς ἂν εἴη μόνον καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μέρη. τί was added by Brandis (Apelt). On the last sentence Apelt notes 'haec forte sic scribenda: εἰ δ' ἐν μόνον ἐστίν, ὁ θεὸς ἂν εἴη, μὲν εἰ καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μέρη. Mullach sic confirmata edidit: εἰ δ' ἐν μόνον ἐστίν ὁ θεός, ἐν ἂν (sic cum uno Bekk. cod.) εἴη μόνον καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μέρη.'

These readings do not seem to give the right sense. The writer here is attacking the argument that the unity of God necessitates his being unlimited. A little below there is a similar passage in which he attacks the argument that the unity of God necessitates his being immovable. The reasoning is parallel and may suggest the emendation of this passage. Here, to the argument that since there is only one God he cannot be limited because limit implies more than one, he objects that God might be limited by something which was not itself God and so the unity of the deity would not be violated. In the other place, similarly, to the argument that since God is one he cannot move because motion implies something else to move to, he objects that God may move to something else, for this something else need not be itself a God.

εἴ τι εἰ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὴ κινεῖται ὁ θεός τε καὶ

τὸ ἐν, ὅτι τὰ πολλὰ κινεῖται τῷ εἰς ἄλλα ἰέναι, τί κωλύει καὶ τὸν θεὸν κινεῖσθαι εἰς ἄλλο; οὐδαμῶς <γὰρ λέγει> ὅτι <ἐν ἐστι> μόνον, ἀλλ' ὅτι εἰς μόνος θεός.

In both arguments however it remains to consider the possibility that Xenophanes did not merely mean that there was only one God, but that there was only one reality and that was God; and though, as appears from the second passage just quoted, Xenophanes does not seem to have put his statement in the latter form the writer nevertheless does consider it:—εἰ δὲ καὶ οὕτως, τί κωλύει εἰς ἄλλα κινουμένων τῶν μερῶν τοῦ <θεοῦ> κύκλῳ φέρεσθαι τὸν θεόν;—and argues that, even if there be nothing but God and he be one, yet he has parts and these give the plurality of positions necessary for motion.

In the first passage, the one before us, the same alternative is obviously put by εἰ δὲ ἐν μόνον ἐστίν, and it is probable from the mention of θεοῦ μέρη that the answer is the same in kind as in the second passage, that is, that though God is one and the only reality he has parts and these constitute the plurality necessary for limitation. In fact God would have πέρας because his parts would limit one another. This would be the same kind of argument as that maintained against Melissus 976^a 11 sqq. 'Even if Being is one (εἰ καί, ὡς αὐτὸς λέγει, ἐν ἐστὶ) yet it has a plurality of parts (ἔχει ἄλλα ἑαυτοῦ μέρη) and these limit one another (ὥστε ταῦτα περαίνει πρὸς ἄλλα).'¹ But it is hard to conjecture what the original form of the passage before us may have been: one might suggest εἰ δ' ἐν μόνον ἐστίν, ὁ θεός, <οὐχ> ἐν ἂν εἴη μόνον καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μέρη, or something similar. ἐν ἂν εἴη is the reading of V^a according to Bekker.

185. 5, 978^b 110, τὸ γὰρ πέρας τινὸς μὲν ἀνάγκη ἴσως εἶναι, οὐ μέντοι πρὸς τί γε, οὐδὲ ἀνάγκη τὸ ἔχον πέρας πρὸς τι ἔχειν πέρας, ὡς πεπερασμένον πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐφεξῆς ἄπειρον, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τὸ πεπερανῆναι ἔσχατα ἔχειν, ἔσχατα δ' ἔχον οὐκ ἀνάγκη πρὸς τι ἔχειν. The editor follows Mullach in reading πρὸς τὸ ἐφεξῆς ἄπειρον, suggests in his note πρὸς τομὴν (*Schnittfläche*) τοῦ ἐφεξῆς ἄπειρου, and quotes Kern's emendation πρὸς τι τοῦ ἐφεξῆς. It is difficult to acquiesce in these conjectures. The whole clause ὡς πεπερασμένον... ἄπειρον is suspicious. In answer to the argument of Xenophanes that if anything has a limit it must be limited by something else, it might indeed be urged that the finite need only be limited by the empty Infinite, or Not-Being, beyond it—τὸ μὴ <ὄν> ἐφεξῆς ἄπειρον: but then the clause, from its position, ought clearly to belong to the statement of Xenophanes' argument and

not to the answer to it, which does not begin till the words ἄλλ' ἔστι τὸ πεπεράνθαι. On the other hand the clause so interpreted seems quite alien to the reasoning attributed to Xenophanes. Cf. 977^b 7. The words would make good sense where they stand if both μὴ and ἄπειρον were omitted: but it would be difficult to justify the omission of either. It seems better to conjecture τὸ μὴ <ὄν> ἐφεξῆς ἄπειρον and suppose that the clause was a marginal note, intended to supplement and explain ἔσχατα δ' ἔχον οὐκ ἀνάγκη πρὸς τι ἔχειν, inasmuch as the πέρας need not be πρὸς τι ὄν but πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὄν conceived as the infinite void surrounding a finite object, and to suppose also that it has been interpolated in the part of the whole sentence to which it does not properly refer. It is not likely to have been an integral part of the text, for it does not really suit the writer's mode of arguing on this subject.

185. 10, 978^b 15, ἐνίους μὲν οὖν συμβαίνει εἰ πᾶν, καὶ πεπεράνθαι <καὶ> πρὸς τι συνάπτειν, τοῖς δὲ πεπεράνθαι μὲν, μὴ μέντοι πρὸς τι πεπεράνθαι. The editor inserts καὶ with Brandis. Is it not likely also that συμβαίνει οἱ γ' ἄν should he read, omitting the first comma?

185. 20, 978^b 24, τὸ μὲν οὖν μὴ κινεῖσθαι ἀληθὲς ἐπὶ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος, τὸ δὲ ἡρεμεῖν οὐχ ὑπάρχει τῷ μὴ ὄντι. ὁμοίως δὲ οὐδὲ ἀκίνητον εἶναι <ὄ> σημαίνει ταῦτόν. ἀλλ' οὗτος ἐπὶ τὸ (v. l. τῷ) ἡρεμεῖν αὐτῷ χρήται. In the last sentence the editor adopts Bonitz' emendation τῷ ἡρεμεῖν ἐπ' αὐτῷ χρήται. But surely the text need not be altered. The meaning is that Xenophanes wrongly uses μὴ κινεῖσθαι as equivalent to ἡρεμεῖν, and so transforms the true proposition τὸ μὴ ὄν οὐ κινεῖται into τὸ μὴ ὄν ἡρεμεῖ. The writer might have expressed himself as Bonitz proposes and perhaps more logically, but the form in the text seems equally possible. αὐτῷ = τῷ μὴ κινεῖσθαι. For the expression compare 978^b 20, τὸ δὲ ἀκίνητον τῷ ἔχειν πως ἤδη λέγεσθαι... καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἐναντίῳ τοῦ κινεῖσθαι, τῷ ἡρεμεῖν.

186. 10, 978^b 34, ἐτι ἐπ' ἐνίων τάναντία συμβαίνειν δοκεῖ κατὰ τὰς ἀποφάσεις· οἷον ἀνάγκη ἢ ἴσον ἢ ἀνισον ἢ τι πλεονος ἢ μέγεθος ἢ, καὶ ἄρτιον ἢ περιττόν ἢ ἀριθμὸς ἢ, ὁμοίως δ' ἴσως καὶ τι ἢ ἡρεμεῖν ἢ κινεῖσθαι ἀνάγκη, ἢν σώμα ἢ. So Lips.; the other MSS.

have κατὰ τοσαύτας. Kern conjectures κατὰ τοιαύτας ἀποφάσεις, and the editor suggests κατὰ τὰς ἐναντίας ἀποφάνσεις. The writer seems merely to wish to say that in the case of some things the negation (ἀπόφασις) of a certain attribute amounts to the affirmation of the contrary of that attribute. Cf. *Met.* 1012^a 9, ἐν ὅσοις γένησιν ἡ ἀπόφασις τὸ ἐναντίον ἐπιφέρει, where also ἀριθμὸς περιττός occurs as an example. Perhaps therefore αὐτὰς represents ἀτάς, due to a repetition of the last letter of κατὰ with the article following it. But the transposition, κατ' αὐτὰς τὰς ἀποφάσεις may be enough. It has just been said that Being may well share some predicates with Not-Being, especially if the predicates are ἀποφάσεις, and now it may be intended to add that in some cases the ἀπόφασις of itself amounted to a contrary. The whole section of the argument to which the passage belongs looks suspiciously like a duplicate of the preceding section. Compare 978^b 27, ὅπερ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω εἰπομεν ἄτοπον ἴσως κ.τ.λ. with 978^b 17, πάλιν περὶ κ.τ.λ. ἴσως ὁμοίως τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἄτοπον, and 978^b 34-38 ἐτι ἐπ' ἐνίων κ.τ.λ. with 978^b 14-27 καὶ ἐτι ἀρά γε κ.τ.λ.

178. 7, 977^a 4. In my previous note on this passage I had forgotten that Eucken (*De Arist. dicendi rat.*, p. 52) has noted two places in Aristotle where ὡς occurs for ὥστε with the infinitive. He says, 'hos tantum locos iuveni: *Pol.* 1256^b 11, 1305^a 29-32.' I have observed the following passage also: *Post. Anal.* 73^b 16, τὰ ἅρα λεγόμενα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπλῶς ἐπιστητῶν καθ' αὐτὰ οὕτως ὡς ἐνυπάρχειν τοῖς κατηγορουμένοις, κ.τ.λ.: but perhaps this is not relevant, because οὕτως ὡς has the sense which it sometimes bears of 'in the sense of.'

The part of the treatise entitled περὶ Γοργίου will be discussed in a subsequent notice.

J. COOK WILSON.

p. 157, col. 2, line 3 from top, for 'would be to the point' read 'would not be to the point.'

p. 162, col. 2, line 9 from top, for 'with the infinite' read 'with the infinitive.'

(To be continued.)

MARCHANT'S SECOND BOOK OF THUCYDIDES.

Thucydides. Book II. edited by E. C. MARCHANT, M.A. Macmillan. 1891. 3s. 6d.

THERE may be room for difference of opinion as to the principles on which Mr. Marchant has treated the text of Thucydides, but there can be none as to the fact that he has produced an excellent and in its own way masterly little edition. Readers of the *Classical Review* know him for a sound scholar, capable of independent work, and, though in this schoolbook there is not very much that can be called exactly new, every page bears witness to the thoroughness and skill with which it has been edited. There are, I should say, few schoolbooks that could be put into boys' hands with more certainty that they would find there nothing inaccurate and nothing vague.

On points of grammar Mr. Marchant is always clear and precise. He belongs to the more rigid school of grammarians, and he thoroughly understands what he is writing about. He avails himself throughout of the evidence now at our disposal as to the real forms of Greek words and their proper spelling: I mean chiefly the evidence afforded by inscriptions and collected in Meisterhans' invaluable book. Of course it matters very little in itself whether we spell *σῶζω* with an iota or not, and a man may be an excellent scholar without knowing or caring anything about it: but accuracy is always good, and it is better to spell as the Greeks spelt. In matters of interpretation he uses an independent judgment to good purpose and usually points out the true meaning in few words. Perhaps the notes on difficult passages are in some cases somewhat too brief. His practice is to give one interpretation only without discussing and usually without noticing others. For boys of a certain age this may be the best policy, but for sixth forms and for university students rather more is required. They may learn a good deal in weighing rival explanations and seeing why one is better than the other. But it is right to repeat that, though Mr. Marchant usually confines himself to giving one view, he always has good grounds for that view; little or nothing which is certainly untenable will be found in his commentary.

In the second chapter of his Introduction he indicates the principles on which he holds that the text of Thucydides is to be dealt with. They may be called the principles of

Cobet, as carried further by Van Herwerden and Dr. Rutherford, and indeed the book is dedicated to the scholar last named. How far these principles are to be received (for that they must be received and acted upon to some extent hardly any competent scholar who has studied the matter will deny) is too large a subject for a short review. Mr. Marchant adopts most of the suggestions made by Cobet and others for leaving out here and there a few words that have the appearance of being an addition made in Byzantine times or earlier for the benefit of schoolboys or other readers in need of assistance. I cannot doubt that such additions were made and that they may sometimes be detected with certainty; but there is great doubt as to details. On the one hand we cannot be sure that Thucydides (and other authors) never used a word too much and never gave any information that was not strictly necessary. Thucydides expected to be read in distant places and at distant times. On the other hand, if we begin cutting out things as unnecessary because a well-informed Greek of Thucydides' own time would not have wanted them, we might probably omit a good deal more than the critics have yet proposed to omit. For instance, in 93.1 of this book Mr. Marchant brackets the latter words of τοῦ Πειραιῶς [τοῦ λιμένος τῶν Ἀθηναίων], but he leaves untouched the words that occur a few lines further about Megara, ἐκ Νισαίας τοῦ νεωρίου αὐτῶν. An Athenian would hardly need this information about Nisaea. So in 55 he writes μέχρι Λαυρείου [οὗ τὰ ἀργύρεα μέταλλά ἐστιν Ἀθηναίους]: but, if so, why not write in 66 ἐστράτευσαν ναυσὶν ἑκατὸν ἐς Ζάκυνθον [τὴν νῆσον ἣ κεῖται ἀντιπέρας Ἡλίδος· εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀχαιῶν τῶν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου ἀποικοὶ καὶ Ἀθηναίους ξυνεμάχων.]? It is indeed pretty apparent from the last words that this ought not to be omitted: but τὴν νῆσον... Ἡλίδος is just like many of the passages removed as 'adscripts': Mr. Marchant's little list of exactly similar notes actually to be found in the scholia is instructive but not absolutely conclusive as to particular passages in the text. In more difficult and sometimes complicated passages, when Mr. Marchant adopts by himself or with others the remedy of excision, the policy of it seems to me very doubtful. Almost the only excision of the sort that really recommends itself to me is that of τῷ μὴ σκεδάνυσθαι in 102.4. As to that of μετέιχον in

16, though it is recommended by the sober Classen, is it likely that some later hand put in a word which was quite unnecessary and which upset the grammar of the sentence? No doubt *μετείχον* is wrong, but it wants emending, not omitting. Then again in 4. 2, *ἐμπείρους δὲ ἔχοντες τοὺς διώκοντας* [τοῦ μὴ ἐκφεύγειν, ὥστε διεφθείροντο οἱ πολλοί], is the addition such as a scholiast would have made? and do the scholiasts use the construction of τοῦ with an infinitive? With regard to 11. 4 *πολλάκις τε τὸ ἐλαττον πλῆθος* [δεδιὸς ἄμεινον] *ἡμίνατο τοὺς πλείους*, which has been discussed in this *Review*, the omission of *ἄμεινον* at any rate seems to me to be rendered impossible by the fact that *ἀμύνεσθαι* τινα means only to resist and fight, not to repulse and vanquish, so that some additional word is absolutely required here. Mr. Marchant has however in this case the support of Dobree.

To show the character of his text in other respects, it may be mentioned that in the Funeral Oration he adopts among others the following emendations: 41. 4, *καλῶν τε κάγαθῶν* for *κακῶν τε κάγαθῶν* (Herwerden): 42. 2, *τῷ ἔργῳ* for *τῶν ἔργων* (Dobree): 42. 4, *κάλλιον* for *μᾶλλον* (Dobree): 43. 1, *ἦν τί ἂν τις* for *ἦν ἂν τις* (Krüger): 44. 1, *ἐνταλαιπωρήσαι* for *ἐντελευτήσαι* (Herwerden): 44. 2, *οἶδα μὴ ποθεῖν* for *οἶδα πείθειν* (his own conjecture). In 7. 2 he adopts Shilleto's ingenious but most unsatisfactory insertion of certain words in a place which they could surely never have occupied, though the whole plausibility of the emendation depends on their insertion in just that place and no other. On the other hand I am

rather surprised at his not adopting *τὴν ἐναντίαν γῆν* for *τὴν ἐναντίων γῆν* in 90. 1; nor does he seem aware that it was suggested independently some time ago by Dr. Henry Jackson.

Attention should be called to an excellent little chapter on the style of Thucydides, and to an admirable index, from the study of which alone no small amount of Greek might be learnt. For instance, under the letter Γ we find a large number of references for the use of *γε*, all the instances in which *γίγνεσθαι* is practically the passive of *ποιεῖσθαι* (ἢ *ἔσδοσ* γίγνεται etc.), a number of references for *γνώμη* with the words (*ἔργον*, *τύχη*, etc.) to which it is opposed, and a collection of the *γνώμαι* of the book. As to *γε*, however, it is very misleading to put down such readings as *οἶπω...γε*, *οὐδέ...γε*, as though there were some connexion between the *οἶπω* and the *γε*, when a reference to the passage shows that *γε* goes with some other word and has absolutely nothing to do with *οἶπω*. Nor ought a word to be omitted from the index because the editor deems it to be wrong. Thus the *μετείχον* with its dative of 16 might surely appear in the index with a query or otherwise, and so too the no doubt erroneous *ἂν* with the future which occurs twice in 80. An index is less useful, and may even be misleading, if such things are not recorded.

I may repeat in conclusion that even where I venture to differ or doubt the book seems to me extremely well done and that it may be cordially recommended.

H. RICHARDS.

CHURCH'S TRANSLATION OF SOME DIALOGUES OF PLATO.

The Trial and Death of Socrates, being the Euthyphron, Apology, Crito and Phaedo of Plato, translated into English by F. J. CHURCH, M.A. London, Macmillan and Co. and New York, 1891. pp. lxxxix. 213. Price 2s. 6d. net.

THIS book consists of five parts, the introduction and the four translated dialogues.

The introduction is written in a flowing and pleasant style, and puts the reader in a position fully to appreciate the dialogues which follow. It begins with a life of Socrates, in which Mr. Church is careful to distinguish between fact and fancy. There

is no word about Myrto, daughter of Aristides the Just, nor of the strange assertion that Socrates had two wives at once. Yet with all his caution Mr. Church has perhaps accepted too much rather than too little. For on what evidence does the oft-repeated statement rest, that the mother of Socrates was 'Phaenarete a midwife' (p. x.)? Simply on that of a bantering passage in the *Theætetus* (149 A), where it is quite possible that Plato is giving the reins to his exuberant imagination, and that this 'buxom and burly' matron is as apocryphal as Mrs. Harris. The name indeed is confirmed by *Alcib.* 131 A, but the coincidence of the

name with the nature of the office is too apposite to Plato's purpose, and too happily illustrative of the mental midwifery of Socrates, to be accepted without demur. The character of Socrates is illustrated in the best possible way by a long extract from the *Symposium* (215 A, &c.), which is given in a corrected version of Shelley's translation. After some lucid remarks on the relation of Socrates to antecedent and contemporary thought as well as on the nature and method of the reform he initiated, the introduction goes on to treat of the dialogues in their order.

The translation of the dialogues is intended, as the preface informs us, 'for the large and increasing class of readers who wish to learn something of the masterpieces of Greek literature, and who cannot easily read them in Greek.' Judging the work from this point of view it cannot be denied that it is admirably done: but as it is the business of the *Classical Review* to look sharply after points of scholarship, I shall make no apology for entering upon a minute examination of the rendering of the dialogues in reference to the Greek.

Euthyphro, p. 4, 3 A, 'striking a blow at the heart of the state.' Has a letter dropped out here? The Greek is ἀφ' ἑστίας ἄρχεσθαι κακουργεῖν τὴν πόλιν. It may be thought that 'heart' is an improvement on 'hearth,' but it is the sanctity of Socrates' character, not his vital connexion with the state, that is being indicated.

P. 9, 5 D. Here the translation seems to miss a point in the original, by not bringing out the naïve vanity of the answer, 'Holiness is doing what I am doing now.'

P. 24, 12 D. 'If you had asked me... what number is an odd number, I should have said that whatever number is not even, is an odd number.' The rendering of τὸ ἄρτιον by 'an odd number' can only be ascribed to oversight. Let us therefore treat the passage on the assumption that 'odd' and 'even' are reversed. The original is 'I should have said that it is any number which is not scalene but isosceles.' It may be difficult to find a rendering suitable to English ears of the terms 'scalene' and 'isosceles,' as applied to numbers: but it is a pity that Plato should here be represented as guilty of the logical vice of a negative definition. Our arithmetic has emancipated itself from any connexion with geometry, but that of the Greeks was based upon the earlier science. The isosceles triangle has its two sides (as distinguished from the base) equal, the scalene triangle

has them unequal. Therefore, as the Scholiast remarks, a number like 8, which divides into two equal integers, is aptly termed isosceles; while a number like 5, which divides into unequal integers, is with equal propriety called scalene. The first odd number is 3, since unity is not a number, but opposed to the idea of number. See on this point Philo, *De Mund. Opif.* § 3—περιττῶν μὲν οὖν ἀριθμῶν ἀρχὴ τριάς, δὲ αὐτῶν. The terms *ισομήκης* and *προμήκης*, as applied to numbers, are borrowed from the parallelogram in the same way as scalene and isosceles are borrowed from the triangle. See *Theaetetus* 148 A, τῷ προμήκει αὐτῷ σχήματι ἀπεικάζαντες προμήκη ἀριθμὸν ἐκαλέσαμεν. But to come back to the point, might not Mr. Church have intelligently represented Plato's meaning in the passage before us by making him say that an 'even' number is 'one which is divisible into equal integers'?

P. 28, 14 C. 'But now I am asking you questions, and must follow wherever you lead me.' Will it be believed that the original here is νῦν δέ—ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸ ἐρώντα τῷ ἐρωμένῳ ἀκολουθεῖν ὅπῃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὑπάγῃ, where Socrates in his usual vein transfers the language of human passion to the passionate search for truth? Certainly Mr. Church was napping at this point: ἐρώντα looks like ἐρωτῶντα and ἐρόμενος may have come in somehow to play its part in the delusion.

Apology, p. 36, 17 C. 'Like a young man with his specious falsehoods' does not seem a very happy rendering of ὥσπερ μειρακίῳ πλάττοντι λόγους, 'like a lad concocting stories.' In the next sentence παρίεμαι does not really mean 'entreat of you,' but 'ask indulgence,' as in *Rep.* 341 C, οὐδὲν σοῦ παρίεμαι, 'I ask no quarter' and in *Eur. Med.* 892—

παρίεμesth, καὶ φαρὲν κακῶς φρονεῖν τότ'.

P. 38, 19 A, 'which you have had against me for a long time.' This loses sight of the fact that ἔρχεστε is an aorist of first attainment, meaning here, as Mr. Adam puts it, 'conceived,' not 'entertained.'

P. 40, 20 C, 'and could teach so cleverly.' ἐμμελῶς here means 'cheaply,' not 'cleverly.' Cp. *Laws* 760 A, *Arist. Pol.* viii. 6, § 8 and possibly *Timaeus* 55 C, ἐμμελῶς ἀποροῖ, πότερον—'were to raise a cheap objection, as to whether.'

P. 52, 26 E, 'buy places in the theatre,' ἐκ τῆς ὀρχήστρας πριαμένους. It is pretty generally accepted now that ὀρχήστρα here

means a part of the Agora, where books may be supposed to have been sold.

P. 64, 33 C. 'I told you the whole truth when I said that &c. The clause beginning *ὅτι ἀκούοντες* is here better taken as an answer to the question with which the chapter opens—'It is because they take delight.' Just below there is reason for once to complain of slipshod English—'And, I say, God has commanded me to examine men in oracles.' In such an examination Onomacritus would, I suppose, have achieved high honours. On the same page there occurs a person called Aeschinus, who must have strayed hither out of the *Adelphi* of Terence.

About the *Crito* I have nothing to say. There are two passages where I disagree with Mr. Church's rendering, but on one of them he has the late Professor Wagner on his side and on the other Mr. Adam. The first of these passages is p. 86, 46 A, 'It will look as if we had shirked the danger' for *διαφευγέμεναι ἡμᾶς δοκεῖν*: the second is p. 99, 53 A, 'for who would be satisfied with a city which had no laws?' *τίνι γὰρ ἂν πόλις ἀρέσκει ἀνεν νόμων*; But these I pass over as disputed points, for I am endeavouring only to hit Mr. Church where he has no friends, not even himself. We pass on therefore now to the *Phaedo*.

P. 112, 62 A. 'But perhaps you will be surprised &c.' Here Mr. Church has wholly missed the sense of the original, and indeed all sense whatever. What Plato is saying is that there are exceptions to the rule that

life is better for a man than death, and that in the case of such exceptions it might plausibly be supposed that a man had a right to commit suicide. At the bottom of the same page 'Oh indeed' seems a very weak rendering for the Boeotian *ἴρτω Ζεὺς* of Cebes. 'God wot' might have had something of the flavour of the original.

P. 145, 79 B. 'There is nothing else, he replied.' But *οὐδὲν ἄλλο* of the original means nothing more than a plain 'yes' in answer to the idiomatic form of question *ἄλλο τι...ῆ*. 'Is it anything else than that &c.'—'It is nothing else than that &c.' and so simply 'yes.'

P. 149, 81 D. 'That is likely, certainly, Cebes: and these are not the souls of the good.' The omission of 'that' here imparts a dogmatic air to the statement, which is foreign to Plato. A question of physical fact could only come under the head of *τὸν εἰκότα μῦθον*, *Tim.* 29 D.

P. 176, 96 D. 'I used to feel no doubt, when I saw a tall man standing by a short one, that the tall man was, it might be, a head the taller, or, in the same way, that one horse was bigger than another.' The meaning is rather 'I was content with my opinion when it seemed to me that &c.' Later on, when his mind had become sophisticated, Socrates could not understand how a thing could be greater by anything but greatness. Just below 'I was even clearer' ought rather to be 'what is even clearer.'

ST. GEORGE STOCK.

HALLIDIE'S *CAPTIVI*.

The Captivi of T. Maccius Plautus, with Introduction and Notes, by ARCHIBALD R. S. HALLIDIE, M.A. London, 1891, Macmillan and Co. 3s. 6d.

THIS volume belongs to the series of plays of Plautus which began with Tyrrell's *Miles Gloriosus* and was continued by Palmer's *Amphitruo*. Its plan is, in general, the same as that of its predecessors, but with less originality in the treatment of the text, and, apparently, with a more exclusive regard for the needs of beginners in Plautus.

In carrying out the plan the editor has shown great industry. The explanation of the metres covers eighteen pages of the Introduction, the prosody twenty-five pages,

and for each there are good collections of examples; the quoting of full lines in illustration of peculiarities of prosody deserves especial praise, and the statistical tables of the occurrence of different feet (pp. xxi. xxiii. xxv) are also valuable and must have cost much labour. The same industry is apparent in the notes; there are useful collections of examples, e.g., on *audio* as an expression of assent (240), on *honore honestes* (247), on *ut* repeated (248), on indirect questions (207), on omission of antecedent pron. (217)—all within fifty lines.

On the other hand it must be said that the editor does not show a wide acquaintance with the work of other scholars or else has gathered his knowledge hastily for use in

this book. The note '*em=en*' (373) is surprising, considering the work that has been done upon this little word (Brix, Ribbeck, Richter); for *dum* there is a good dissertation (Elste) and a very good one (Richardson), either better than Ramsay's Excursus. The notes on *quom* are full enough, but seem to have been written without the help of Lubbert's collection of examples or Hale's discussion of *quom*. The notes on *quod* and *quia* should have been taken from Zimmermann, not from Brix. The 'interrogative *nam*' appears to be traditional, but there is no such thing. On p. 79 the editor condemns the whole prologue and says that it is 'assigned by Ritschl to the middle of the 1st century B.C.' This is hasty; what Ritschl says is that *in its present form* it must have been written not far from 607, i.e. near the middle of the second century B.C. And is there authority for a curtain rolled down to the stage in the theatre of Plautus?

It must also be said that there is at times a lack of scholarly precision of statements. Thus the doubled letter of *repperi* (761) is said to be due 'perhaps' to one cause, 'perhaps' to another, 'perhaps' to both. In the *Introd.*, p. xx., the spondee is not 'almost invariable in 5th' place; the table on p. xxi. gives 90 non-spondaic 5th feet in 327 vs. The editor has confused feet with word-feet. In regard to the hiatus no two men have ever agreed, and one may say almost anything with impunity, but it is distinctly wrong to treat hiatus at the caesura of iamb. senar. as if it were gen-

erally admitted, and to class monosyllabic hiatus among those 'which are far from being generally accepted.' The notes on *tamen* seem to be inconsistent with each other; two different uses of *quod sciam* appear to be confused (265); on *uti adseruentur* (115) the editor hesitates between Brix and Sonnenschein, but without taking into account the possibility that it may be an independent subjunctive, as in *Liv. i. 18, 9*. The explanations are sometimes hasty and fanciful, not so much wrong as regardless of philological method: e.g. the explanation of the spondee in the even feet and of the caesura; *opus est* (159) is said to take the abl. because the original meaning was 'there is work to be done with' (cf. Wölfflin's *Archiv*, II. 2); *eccum* (169), 'the acc. depends upon *ecce* as if it were *uide*'; the explanation of *nonne* (714) looks like a mere guess and is wholly wrong.

It is in no spirit of condemnation that these errors or questionable statements are pointed out; rather it is because this book contains so much good work that it is capable of becoming a useful edition of the *Captivi*. Editions of this type, which seems to be a favourite one in England and to be suited to the needs of University work there, are not always strong upon the side of text or of philological criticism, but they are always convenient for their commentary on points of antiquities, and this volume may be brought by revision in a second edition within this most useful class.

E. P. MORRIS.

Yale University.

MERRY'S FRAGMENTS OF LATIN POETRY.

Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry, from the earliest times of the Republic to the Augustan Age, edited with Introductions and Notes by W. W. MERRY, D.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. Pp. 260. Price 6s. 6d.

AN editor, to whom students young and old owe so much as to the Rector of Lincoln College, can hardly escape being measured by a comparative standard. One is tempted to regard this volume of Selections as a plea for arrest of judgment on the high crime and misdemeanour of not giving us more Aristophanes, or completing

the larger edition of the *Odyssey*; and to consider whether it may pass as a legitimate set-off. But after all, even a successful editor retains some right of free choice for his future action; and it is fairer to look at this book in itself, and not as postponing the desiderated *Wasps* or *Peace*. There can be no doubt that Dr. Merry has set himself to meet a real want, and that he has done what he has attempted admirably. There was no book published in England, nor, so far as I know, abroad, which served as a convenient text-book to be put into the hands of students attending lectures on early Latin poetry. Bishop Wordsworth's

well-known volume gives at once too little and too much, even if it was not almost excluded by its cost. Bährens' sixth volume does not touch the tragic or comic poets, and Ribbeck's two volumes are much too cumbersome and costly. Dr. Merry's book is just what was wanted. But—to get rid at once of grumbings—it seems to be a matter for regret that in giving us so much he did not give a little more. He has 'made no attempt to present a critical text, or to settle questions of metrical arrangement.' This is all very well for the student who is guided by a competent lecturer, for the teacher will of course have access to the critical authorities, and will use them to control the text-book; but it is rather hard upon the meritorious class who study by themselves. Dr. Merry has reprinted the texts as they are given by Ribbeck, Riese or Bährens with rare deviations, and hardly ever lets us know what the reading of the MSS. is, and why or by whom it has been altered. Doubtless he regards these editors as great authorities, but he may be assured that his own judgment would be valued quite as highly by English scholars as that of any of them, and far more highly than that of a most industrious but most reckless critic like Bährens. At all events, it would have been an immense addition to the value of the book if we had had in all cases the reading of the MSS. at the foot of the page, and the name of the author of the accepted emendation. It is true that the MSS. of the different sources are often extremely corrupt, and that emendation is both imperative and uncertain. But nothing is gained by disguising this. Mr. Sidgwick has shown in his *Oresteia* how well what is needed can be done even for schoolboys; and very few schoolboys will be among Dr. Merry's readers.

To give examples:—in *Carm. Sal.* ii. *prætet trementi* is printed without a hint that it is due solely to an emendation by Bergk, which is now generally rejected (cf. Jordan, *Krit. Beitr.* p. 219, Stolz, *Verballex.* i. 26). In App. Claud. i. the order of the words is purely conjectural; so is the reading of Marc. iii. In Liv. Andr. 28, 2 the MSS. give *duona eorum*: the text printed has *advenit servae*. In *ib.* 32 *paucus* is very doubtful, and certainly has no authority. In 22 *corpus* is substituted for *peius*. In all these cases (and their number could be increased) there is something to be said for the change: but it would have been better that it should have been said. The same holds good of the selections from Ribbeck's fragments of

the scenic poets. It is surprising however that Dr. Merry did not accept Bücheler's excellent *illaesae* for *in sese* (Naev. *Lyc.* i.) approved by Ribbeck (*Coroll.* xii.). The reading in Naev. *Tunic.* i. seems very doubtful, and hardly metrical. In *Iphig.* there is not a trace of authority for either *velod* or *med*. In the *Saturae* of Ennius two or three readings of Bährens are adopted with little necessity, and without warning; yet sometimes his text is departed from, e.g. *nam tibi munimenta*, where Bährens (keeping closer to the MSS.) has *namque tibi monumenta*. In Accius *Med.* ii. Ribbeck's *sicut lascivi* is by no means near enough to the traditional *sicut inciti* to be received with any confidence: in Acc. *Andr.* iv. his *quei* is extremely doubtful.

With regard to the explanatory notes, Dr. Merry's practice, except indeed in the quality of what he gives, is not quite consistent. On the earliest fragments he is fairly liberal, and so he is again when he comes to Lucilius. Elsewhere he is very sparing. In many cases the brief and altogether excellent little introductions almost do away with the need of footnotes, but this is not always the case. Even if the use of the dictionary is assumed—and it is not always in the earlier notes—this will not remove all difficulties of syntax or metre, on which many who will read the book will look for help. It is rarely and with much diffidence that one is tempted to differ from some of the explanations. On Enn. *Alex.* iv. 6 the absence of a comma after *mei* leaves the sentence very obscure: and the punctuation of the last line of Pacuv. *Teuc.* iii. makes a note necessary. The second of the epigrams assigned to Ennius needs a word of explanation as to its subject. In Pacuvius *Nipt.* viii. *subinis* needs a note as much as any of the words that are so favoured. The notes on Lucilius are particularly good. But there is an unsolved difficulty as to the mention of Congus in xxvi. 1. Dr. Merry says his name 'must represent the average citizen.' This is certainly what the context in Lucilius suggests. But where Congus is elsewhere mentioned, it is as a man 'curiosus et diligens eruendae vetustatis' (Schol. Vet. on *Planc.* 24, 58), and as an authority on history. The solution seems to be suggested by *de Orat.* ii. 25, where Cicero, quoting a similar line in which D. Laelius is mentioned, explains that Lucilius meant 'neque ab indoctissimis se neque ab doctissimis legi velle.' This Congus must have been a man of at least some general culture. After all it

perhaps admits of doubt whether the Congus of Lucilius was the same man that we hear of from other sources. Cicero in *de Orat.* i. 256 represents Antonius in B.C. 91 as going to Congus for instances from history and information on points of law. In B.C. 54 he speaks of him as dead (*Planc.* l.c.), in a way which suggests that he had but recently died. The latter date makes it necessary for us to put his birth as late as we can, consistently with the way in which Antonius speaks of him. We can hardly suppose him to have been much younger than Antonius, or to have been born much later than B.C. 140. Even to put him as early as this would imply that he was about eighty-five when he died. On the other hand, the twenty-sixth book of the *Satires* of Lucilius is confessedly the earliest of all, and was composed about B.C. 130. It seems pretty clear that the Congus of Lucilius was the unlearned father of a learned son; and if so Dr. Helden's note on *Planc.* l.c. will have to be rewritten.

On metrical questions Dr. Merry abstains as a rule from pronouncing an opinion, and follows his authorities; but here too more independence of judgment would have been welcomed. Yet in Naevius *Inc. Fab.* i. 3 the scansion of Ribbeck seems far better

than that which is silently substituted. In *Acc. Epig.* v. *datur bona* as an equivalent for an anapaest calls for discussion. In Varro *Ōvos λύpas* vii. it is a pity not to recognize the unmistakable octonarians, and in *ib.* ix. the scazons are queerly accented. In Varro *Sexag.* xiii. and xiv. the trochaics are similarly evident, though apparently not recognized. In *Marcopolis* iii. 1 the reading *emissum intimo* restores excellent metre, whereas *intimō missum* as printed is impossible. In *ib.* *Est Modus* i. 3 *hoc hilaritatis* is misprinted *hoc hilaritatis*. In *Aborig.* i. and ii. a word on the metre would be acceptable.

But on the whole Dr. Merry has done admirably what he has attempted. If it is true, as he says, that most of the work of interpretation has been done before, it is no less true that it has been done in a way which makes it not very accessible, and in some cases by no means attractive to English students. He may rest assured that he has succeeded in making the study of these fragments more easy and more interesting, and if in a future edition he helps towards making it more critical, we shall be still more thankful.

A. S. WILKINS.

SELLAR'S HORACE AND THE ELEGIAC POETS.

The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age, by W. Y. SELLAR, M.A., LL.D., late Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh and formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, with a Memoir of the Author, by ANDREW LANG, M.A., and a portrait. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1892.

THE volume on Horace and the Elegiac Poets completing the late Professor Sellar's valuable and fascinating studies in Latin poetry will be heartily welcomed by all classical scholars, and by that far larger class which, without claiming scholarship technically so called, feels a lively interest in Ancient Literature. To the latter the volume before us will be the more acceptable because it is not so likely as works of its kind often are to disturb their preconceived judgment or to demand a modification of traditional beliefs. The eminent scholar, whose death only a little more than a year ago was so deeply deplored by the world of

letters, in this his last volume seems to have desired to avoid avenues of criticism which, however attractive, would have led him out of his main road. He has put before us with that elegance of style which we are accustomed to expect from him a view of Horace not very different from that which the man of the world forms or accepts. Those who have read in the *Classical Review* for last January and February (vol. vi. nos. 1, 2, p. 28), Mr. Page's discriminating notice of Hartman's *De Horatio poeta* will have seen what startling views may be propounded about the literary value of Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes*; nor is opinion much more homogeneous concerning the genesis and true character of the *Satires* and *Epistles*, or the whole question of the relation of the poet to his materials and to his predecessors. These topics are very slightly treated in the present work, and the place of Horace among genuine poets is assumed to be generally conceded. We must all agree with Professor Sellar that we owe to

R

Horace a precious store of pointed aphorisms and shrewd comments on life which, apart from all such controversies as those to which we have referred, must have a permanent (perhaps an increasing) value for the world; and when we consider how discrepant (almost contradictory of each other) are the judgments of critics and scholars who with unbiassed (or shall we say irreverent?) feelings have approached the task of analysing Horace's work and appraising its worth, we are the more disposed to congratulate ourselves on the method which Professor Sellar has adopted, and to turn from Goethe, Lehrs, Gruppe, Hartman, Peerkamp, and the rest of the analytical school with the shrewd comment of Horatio 'T were to consider too curiously to consider so.'

Professor Sellar is far from the bigotry of those who wax indignant if to Horace is not accorded all the emotional ardour of Sappho and Catullus, all the literary insight of Aristotle and Quintilian. If his enthusiasm for Latin Literature makes him rather an advocate of Horace's claim to rank among the great poets of the world than a judge holding the balance between rival theorists, we must at least allow that his advocacy is as temperate as it is eloquent, and that his presentment of his views teems with suggestiveness and instruction. While desirous of dwelling chiefly on the good gifts of the poet, he is not blind to the limitations of his art. He admits that Horace's *liaisons* with the Leuconoes and Neobules of his *Odes*, 'whether they are of the *Dichtung* or of the *Wahrheit* of his life, seem to be as much inspired by an interest in human nature as by any more ardent feeling,' and that his tone 'is more that of *persiflage* than of either ardent passion or tender sentiment.' In his lampoons he allows that the feeling by which Horace was moved was 'sometimes that of the imitative artist rather than the man'; and that 'even in Horace's maturest art the thought is often obvious and commonplace.' But he claims that even the *Odes* show him as 'one who is emphatically an artist and a poet of culture'; and in comparing Horace with Catullus he writes 'where he is superior to Catullus is in the wider range and greater dignity of his art. He is in sympathy with human life in many more of its relations. It is permissible to think that Catullus had a stronger and more vivid nature, and yet to hold that the work of Horace, even if limited to the *Odes*, is a more important contribution to the Roman literature, that

it is more truly representative of the idea of Rome, than any other work except the *Aeneid*, and that it bears the stamp of immortality—artistic perfection—more surely than any work except the *Georgics*.'

We recognise again with pleasure those frequent references to analogies in modern literature which made Professor Sellar's earlier volumes on the Roman Poets of the Republic and on Virgil so interesting and attractive. We admire the subtlety of many of his analyses, and the unerring taste with which he unfolds beauties in the diction of the poet. These, too, are qualities which his other works led us to expect, and they are everywhere manifest in the present volume. But we must regard as chimerical the attempt to elicit from such occasional pieces as the books of the *Odes* present to us anything like a connected theory of life. Such attempts are never without a certain plausibility, but often the more specious the appearance they wear the more are they erroneous or at least baseless. In the words of Herodotus concerning the different theories to account for the overflowing of the Nile, ἡ ἐπιχειρησάτη εὐδαιμονία μᾶλλον ἐψεύσται.

In dealing with the elegiac poets Professor Sellar has a far more untrodden field, and, if we are not mistaken, allows a freer rein to his personal judgment. His chapter on the Roman Elegy is full of fresh and stimulating criticism. Messalla and his coterie emerge out of the twilight of mere allusion into the clear sunshine of sympathetic characterisation, and for the first time in English (so far as we are aware) Tibullus receives his due meed as a true poet. Professor Sellar compares Tibullus with Gray, and as regards his art and his personality he places him above Propertius and Ovid. He dismisses with emphatic curttness the poetic pretensions of Lygdamus, as well as the theory once widely accepted that his verses are the work of Tibullus—'With no hint of the artistic excellence of Tibullus in rhythm or diction it shows more than any other extant Latin work the faults most alien to his art, irrelevant learning and exaggerated rhetoric...The poem is to be regarded as a strange specimen of a fly preserved in amber.'

The remains of Sulpicia he regards as having a real value. He does not attempt to decide the question whether Tibullus had any share in the poems of Sulpicia. They are not in his judgment unworthy of Tibullus, 'though they would imply a different application of his art and genius

from that which we find in the two books of elegies. Whoever is their author they have a real value as poetry, and a unique value as a most interesting page from the active life of the time.'

In his two chapters on Propertius we could wish that Professor Sellar had given us more criticism on his poetry and less discussion as to his birthplace. However he has, in our mind, seized the quality which has secured for Propertius and will for ever maintain for him his niche in the temple of fame, when he writes, 'If the rank of a poet were to be assigned by the weight and power of single lines and phrases no Roman poet would be more worthy than Propertius to be placed beside Virgil and Lucretius. No others show in their language so much energy and variety of imagination, so vivid a susceptibility to powerful emotions, so much capacity of receiving and interpreting certain aspects of beauty in art, in nature, and in human passions.' The same point of view is well developed in the acute and tasteful criticism applied by Professor Sellar to a comparison between the lament for Paetus (iii. 7) and the *Lycidas* of Milton. On the whole, it would be well for the fame of Propertius if we could adopt the suggestion of Aeneas in the *Ranae*, and weigh poetry by butchers' weight in the scales. Tried by his test he would surpass Ovid as easily as Aeschylus prevailed over Euripides. Ovid even at his best, as in

Qui bene pro patria cum patriaque iacent,
could hardly produce a pentameter to outweigh

Viximus insignes inter utramque facem,

or

Iura dare et statuas inter et arma Mari,

or

Nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne
mare est,

or

Et trahere occultum membra soporis iter.

The short chapter on Ovid was quite incomplete at its writer's death. It represents merely the framework laid down for an essay which was to be as complete as those on Horace, Propertius, and Tibullus. The biography of Ovid and the later poems are left untouched, but the fragment teems with clever *aperçus*. It sketches the rise of a school of love-poetry which regards love merely as physical desire not serious passion, and in which the lover aspires to nothing higher than *bonne fortune*—an epoch which is sure to come, and only too soon, in the train of civilisation. The elegiac muse is no longer *stebilis*; she is now *genialis*. Men do not love but intrigue, and we begin to foresee the entrance on the scene of the modern *femme souffrante*. Professor Sellar agrees with Macaulay in regarding the *Art of Love*, which he compares with Byron's *Don Juan*, as the greatest work of Ovid. Of the *Metamorphoses* he shrewdly remarks that 'though in no ancient poem do the old gods play a larger part, no work is more irreligious.'

The memoir of Professor Sellar prefixed to the volume is by his kinsman and pupil Mr. Andrew Lang. We need not add that it is admirably written and most interesting.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

A MODERN GREEK TREATISE ON THE CRETAN DIALECT.

Περὶ τῆς Κρητικῆς Διαλέκτου, ὑπὸ Ἀνδρέου Ν. Σκιά, Δ. Φ. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφείου Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου. 1891.

INDUSTRY and good judgment, rather than originality, are the chief characteristics of this new monograph on the Cretan dialect. The author brings forward little that is new; his work in the main consists simply in a methodical presentation of the accepted facts of the dialect,—chiefly of its phonology. This service is not without value. The most recent treatise on the dialect, Herforth's *De Dialecto Cretica* (Halle, 1887),

was far from satisfactory, while the discovery of new inscriptions has added to our sources of knowledge.

The author's theory concerning the employment of E and H in archaic inscriptions (pp. 108 ff.) deserves consideration. His hypothesis is that the use of these two characters was analogous to their employment in early Naxian and Cean inscriptions, in which, as demonstrated by Dittenberger, E represents primitive Greek η, while H represents the η of secondary origin. Similarly Dr. Σκιά maintains that in the earliest Cretan inscriptions of Lyttos and

Oaxos E represented the η resulting from contraction, while H represents primitive Greek η . This view, however, as the author himself is forced to admit, is directly contradicted by the employment of H to designate the η -sound arising by compensative lengthening; so that the variation in question, if it actually have etymological significance, must be explained on other grounds than those suggested by the author.

In the discussion of Cretan infinitives in $-\mu\eta\eta$ (p. 112) we miss a reference to

Brugmann's explanation of these forms as locatives (*Gr. Gr.*² p. 104). Cf. Avestan $-\bar{a}n$. Dr. Σκού, on the other hand, regards H in this termination as an inaccurate designation of the short e -sound, so that to him $\delta\acute{o}\mu\eta\eta$ is for $\delta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\eta$,—a conclusion rendered the more doubtful by the fact that no other instance of H in this function occurs, except in the very infinitives which it is thus proposed to explain.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Brown University,
Providence, R.I.

JOSEPHUS.

Flavii Josephi Opera. Edidit et apparatu critico instruxit BENEDICTUS NIESE. Vol. iv. Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Libri xvi.–xx. et Vita.

We are glad to welcome the appearance of another volume of Niese's critical edition of Josephus. The learned editor has reserved all discussion of the text contained in the present volume for a full treatment in his preface to the third volume, which we hope he will soon be able to give us. We observe that, as in former editions, the spurious passage (*Ant.* xviii. 3. 3) containing a reference to Jesus as the Messiah, to His crucifixion and resurrection, is retained in square brackets. In deference to the principles upon which he edits his text, Niese has restored several MSS. readings which call for emendation. Thus in *Ant.* xvi. 2. 2 we find $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\alpha\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \chi\eta\rho\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\eta\ \eta\eta\ \eta\pi\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\eta\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\eta\varsigma$, where editions following the Codex Vaticanus (V) have read $\eta\ \delta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. Niese doubtfully conjectures $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\omega\varsigma$: we will suggest $\eta\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. Another instance occurs in *Ant.* xvii. 9. 8 $\tau\acute{o}\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omega\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\eta\ \phi\theta\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \epsilon\eta\ \beta\alpha\beta\upsilon\lambda\omega\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\eta\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\alpha\iota\ \kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\ \phi\iota\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\eta\ \Sigma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\alpha\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$, where Hudson's $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ has hitherto found favour, and $\acute{\alpha}\ \phi\iota\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ also is commonly read. Among other readings which have attracted our notice, may be mentioned *Antiq.* xvii. 9. 2 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \eta\eta\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\ \nu\ \acute{\omicron}\rho\gamma\eta\ \chi\eta\rho\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\eta$, where the editions have read $\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\eta$, and where, the Ambrosian (A) and Vatican (M) MSS. reading $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\eta$, the conjecture $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\eta\eta$ is hazarded, 'nam lapides in eos coniectos esse narrat bell. jud.' (Niese): xviii. 5. 1 $\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\eta\tau\alpha\eta\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\rho\eta\eta$, where we have been accustomed to read $\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\eta\tau\alpha\eta\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha$: *Vita*, c. 10 $\Gamma\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\eta\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \beta\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\alpha\eta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\rho\iota\omega$, where the MSS. show an extraordinary variety of readings and editions have given us $\Gamma\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\eta\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \Gamma\alpha\beta\alpha\rho\eta\eta\eta$, $\Sigma\omega\gamma\alpha\eta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\rho\iota\omega$: c. 70 $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\eta\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\eta$, where the proper name appears instead of $\kappa\rho\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\sigma\eta\eta$.

Possessors of Niese's vol. v. *Contra Apionem* should take notice that an 'Addendum' to its *Apparatus Criticus* is prefixed to this volume.

We are glad to see that useful cross references to parallel passages in the *Bellum Iudaicum* are placed at the foot of the text, wherever, as is so often the case in the narrative of *Antiq.* xvi.–xviii., the same ground is traversed in both works.

H. E. RYLE.

The works of Flavius Josephus. Whiston's Translation Revised by the Rev. A. R. SHILLETO, M.A. (London: George Bell and Sons. 1889–1890). 5 vols.

WHISTON'S translation of Josephus has been one of the most popular books in English literature. In the first quarter of the present century there were probably few houses in which, if a score of books stood upon the shelves, Whiston's 'Josephus' did not hold an honoured place among the indispensable literature of the family. In the present day it has not altogether been dethroned. If its frequent appearance at railway-bookstalls is any indication, we should judge that there is even now a steady demand for the work. And those of us who can recollect the impressions of frequent incursions into—we will not say perusal of—Whiston's 'Josephus' in our boyhood, will not be at a loss to understand the secret of its fascination.

The need of a revised edition has long been felt; and we have now before us such an edition, published for Bohn's Standard Library and prepared by Mr. A. R. Shilleto, who is also known as a translator of Plutarch's *Morals*. It is probable that the five handy little volumes which are the result of this undertaking will receive a hearty welcome from the English reading public. Their outward appearance is taking, and the print compares most favourably with that to which we are generally accustomed in reprints of Whiston's work.

As to the translation itself, Mr. Shilleto has endeavoured to improve it in two ways, by correcting errors of scholarship and by simplifying the style of the English. In some measure he has succeeded. But he quite overstates the case when he asserts in his preface that 'there is, indeed, not much of Whiston left though I have retained him where practicable.' If his object was to produce a more literal rendering, he might with advantage have made a greater sacrifice of Whistonian style, in order to secure a more scholarly result.

The impression produced upon us by the first few passages which we compared was that of considerable disappointment. Thus in the well-known passage $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\eta\ \gamma\epsilon\eta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\eta\ \tau\omega\eta\ \pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\omega\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\iota\beta\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\delta\omicron\chi\eta\eta$ (*Contr. Ap.* i. 8), Whiston's rendering 'because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time' is altered to 'because there was not then an exact succession of prophets': and in the following chapter, where Whiston gives 'I made use of some persons to assist me in learning the Greek

tongue' (*Contr. Ap. i. 9* χρησάμενός τιςι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοίς), it was rather a shock to find our old friend dressed up by Mr. Shilleto as 'I employed some *collaborateurs* to be *au fait* in the Greek idioms.' We notice that Whiston's energetic 'God confound thee, thou vile wretch' (*Bell. Ind. i. 31*, ὁ φθείρου δυσσεβεστάτῃ κεφαλῇ) has now a very artificial ring, 'A murrain on thee, vile wretch,' while such an expression as 'having the countenances of persons of royal dignity' (*Ant. xvi. 1. 1* καὶ βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὰς μορφὰς ἀξιώματος οὐκ ἀποδόντες) is left unaltered, and in the following chapter (ii. 1) the

difficult sentence ἐστία δὲ τὸν δῆμον οὐδενὸς τῶν μεγίστων πλήθει λειπόμενος finds Mr. Shilleto acquiescent in Whiston's 'and feasted the people, without omitting any of the greatest dainties,' where the other reading λειπόντων might at least have supplied a hint as to the meaning. But the reader will be able to form his own judgment of the nature of Mr. Shilleto's revision by a comparison of two longer portions, which may be taken as fairly representing the merits and defects of the whole work, with Whiston as he appears in an ordinary reprint (1886: T. Nelson and Sons).

Antiq. Bk. ii. 16, 5.

WHISTON.

As for myself I have delivered every part of this history as I found it in the sacred books; nor let any one wonder at the strangeness of the narration, if a way were discovered to those men of old time, who were free from the wickedness of the modern ages, whether it happened by the will of God, or whether it happened of its own accord,—while for the sake of those that accompanied Alexander, King of Macedonia who yet lived, comparatively, but a little while ago, the Pamphylian sea retired and afforded them a passage through itself, when they had no other way to go; I mean when it was the will of God to destroy the monarchy of the Persians: and this is confessed to be true by all that have written about the actions of Alexander, but as to these events let every one determine as he pleases.

(Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὡς εἶρον ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις οὕτως ἕκαστον τοῦτον παραδέδωκα· θαυμάσιον δὲ μηδεὶς τοῦ λόγου τὸ παράδοξον, εἰ ἀρχαίοις ἀνθρώποις καὶ πονηρίας ἀείροις εὐρέθη σωτηρίας ὁδὸς καὶ διὰ θαλάσσης εἶτε κατὰ βούλησιν θεοῦ εἶτε κατὰ ταῦτόματον, ὅποτε καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν βασιλεῖα τῆς Μακεδονίας χθὲς καὶ

Bell. Ind. ii. 8, 3.

WHISTON.

These men are despisers of riches and so very communicative as raises our admiration. Nor is there anyone to be found among them who hath more than another; for it is a law among them that those who come to them must let what they have be common to the whole order, insomuch, that among them all there is no appearance of poverty or excess of riches, but every one's possessions are intermingled with every other's possessions. And so there is, as it were, one patrimony among all the brethren. They think that oil is a defilement, and if any one of them be anointed without his own approbation, it is wiped off his body; for they think to be sweaty is a good thing, as they do also to be clothed in white garments. They also have stewards appointed to take care of their common affairs, who every one of them have no separate business for any but what is for the use of all.

(καταφρονηταὶ δὲ πλοῦτον καὶ θαυμάσιον παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ κοινωνητικόν, οὐδὲ ἔστιν εὐρεῖν κτήσει τινα παρ' αὐτοῖς ὑπερέχοντα· νόμος γὰρ τοῖς εἰς τὴν αἵρεσιν εἰσιόντας δημεῖν τῷ τάγματι τὴν οὐσίαν, ὥστε ἐν ἅπασιν μὴτε πένιαν ταπεινότητα φαίνεσθαι μηδ' ὑπεροχὴν πλοῦτον, τῶν δὲ ἐκάστου κτημάτων ἀναμεμιγμένων μίαν

Many of Whiston's notes are retained; and to these have been added topographical notes by Sir Charles Wilson, who supplies the modern equivalents of the names of places mentioned in the text. The volumes will therefore have a special value and a new interest for those who have travelled in, or have acquaintance with the geography of, Modern Palestine.

WHISTON (SHILLETO).

As for myself I have delivered every part of this account as I found it in the sacred books. And let no one wonder at the strangeness of the narration, if a way of safety through the sea were discovered to those men of old time who were free from wickedness, whether by the will of God, or by chance, since for Alexander, King of Macedonia, and his suite, who lived only the other day, the Pamphylian sea retired and afforded them a passage through itself, when they had no other way to go, when it was the will of God to destroy the monarchy of the Persians. And this is recorded as true by all that have written about the exploits of Alexander. But as to these events let every one think as he pleases.

πρόην γεγονόσιν, ὑπεχώρησε τὸ Παμφύλιον πέλαγος καὶ ὁδὸν ἄλλην οὐκ ἔχουσι παρέσχε τὴν δι' αὐτοῦ καταλῦσαι τὴν Περσῶν ἡγεμονίαν τοῦ θεοῦ βελήσαντος, καὶ τοῦτο πάντες ὁμολογοῦσιν οἱ τὰς Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις συγγραψάμενοι. περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ὡς ἐκάστῃ δοκεῖ διαλαμβάνετω.)

WHISTON (SHILLETO).

These men are despisers of riches, and wonderfully communistic, nor is there anyone to be found among them who possesses more than another. For it is a law among them, that those who join their sect must let what they have be common to the whole body; insomuch that among them all there is no appearance of abject poverty or excess of riches, but every one's property forms a common stock, and is, as it were, one patrimony for all the brethren. They think oil a defilement, and if any one of them gets any on his body against his will, he wipes his body; for they think to be dry is a good thing, as also to be continually clothed in white garments. They also elect people to manage their common affairs, who have each no business of their own but only act for the society.

ὥσπερ ἀδελφοῖς ἅπασιν οὐσίαν εἶναι. κηλῖδα δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὸ ἔλαιον, καὶ ἂν ἀλιφῇ τις ἄκω, σμῆχεται τὸ σῶμα· τὸ γὰρ αὐχμεῖν ἐν καλῷ τίθενται, λευχειμονεῖν τε διαπαντός. χειροτονητοὶ δὲ οἱ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμεληταί, καὶ ἀδίαίρετοι πρὸς ἅπαντων εἰς τὰς χρεῖας ἕκαστοι.)

A few conjectural emendations of the text, which Mr. Shilleto has made use of, are also to be found at the foot of the page; but, so far as we have investigated them, they do not contribute much to our knowledge of the text or to the value of the translation.

H. E. RYLE.

In Varronis Saturas Menippeas Observationes Selectae, scriptis EDUARDUS NORDEN. Leipzig, Teubner, 1891.

A REPRINT from the Supplement of the *Jahrbücher* (pp. 276—346). The essay will be found valuable not only in itself, but also on account of its numerous collections of passages bearing upon Greek and Latin popular philosophy. Probably no one work, had it survived, would have told us so much on this subject as the Menippean satires of Varro. The chapter on the *Eumenides* (p. 329 foll.) is especially interesting. H. N.

Extracts from various Greek Authors. An Accompaniment to Xenophon's *Anabasis* and for the Cultivation of Sight-reading. By CHARLES TUDOR WILLIAMS. New York. Henry Holt and Co. 1890. Pp. 231.

THIS book gives more than the title-page promises, in three maps (of the Persian kingdom, the Expedition of Cyrus, and Greece and Asia Minor) with copious Indices, a Historical Chart, a Table of Irregular Greek Verbs (so arranged as to show at a glance the tenses used in Attic), and Tables of common Greek weights, measures, and moneys. Most of the 147 extracts are selected for the illustration of Xenophon's *Anabasis*. We find here the pertinent passages from the *Panegyric* of Isocrates, and from Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes*, from Herodotus, Strabo, and Pausanias. The connexion of some extracts is not very close, as when the story of the mob at Ephesus is quoted from the Acts of the Apostles since Ephesus is mentioned in the *Anabasis*. In general, however, the extracts are well selected and could be made useful in enlivening the pupil's elementary course. The editor has striven to adapt them for exercises in reading at sight by adding at the foot of the page the translation of unfamiliar words and the hint to the right construction of the more difficult passages. The miscellaneous historical, geographical, and grammatical matter seems to be what the editor has found useful in his own experience. The plan of the work is certainly novel. T. D. S.

The Story of the Iliad. By ALFRED J. CHURCH, M.A.

The Story of the Odyssey. By the same. London, Seeley & Co. 1892. 5s. each.

THESE delightful books are a considerable expansion of Prof. Church's *Stories from Homer* first published in one volume fourteen years ago. The narrative is lively and graceful; and in all respects a faithful reproduction of the Homeric spirit. The illustrations after Flaxman are, considering the low price of the books, decidedly good, especially those representing the defence of the ships by Ajax in the *Iliad* and the killing of the Suitors in the *Odyssey*. Shall we be thought pedantic in complaining that the hero of the *Odyssey* always appears as Ulysses?

Atlas Antiquus. Twelve maps of the Ancient World for Schools and Colleges by DR. HENRY KIEPERT, M.R. Acad. Berlin. Tenth edition, revised and enlarged. Boston and New York, 1892: Leach, Shewell and Sanborn. \$2.00.

A GOOD atlas forms so necessary a part of the working library of every classical student that any accession to the list of available books is very welcome. Dr. Kiepert's Atlas in its new edition may fairly be considered such an accession, English and American, in that it now bears the imprint of an American publishing house and is offered at a price which puts it within the reach of all. The merits of the Atlas are so well known to scholars in general that an extended review of the work is unnecessary. In this new edition all the excellence of former editions has been preserved, while the maps have been revised and made to show, as far as is desirable in a work of this character, the latest advances in geographical knowledge. Five of the maps bear date of August, 1890; the rest are of later date, map V. (Greece and the Islands of the Aegean) having been finished in September 1891.

The Index is a model of what an index should be, giving every name shown on the maps.

ALBERT A. HOWARD.

Harvard University.

NOTES.

EUR. *Iph. Taur.* vv. 285-290.

Πολάδῃ, δέδορκα τήνδε; τήνδε δ' οὐχ ὄρῃς
"Αἶδον δράκαινα, ὥς με βούλεται κτανεῖν
δειναῖς ἐχίδναις εἰς ἐμ' ἐστομωμένη;
ἥ δ' ἐκ χιτῶνα πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον
πετροῖς ἐρέσσει, μητέρ' ἀγκάλαις ἐμὴν
ἔχουσα, πέτρῳ ὄχθον, ὥς ἐπεβάλλῃ.

In these verses two points deserve notice. First, the words ἐκ χιτῶνων (v. 288), which appear to have offended the editors generally, with the exception of Seidler and Nauck, may be illustrated by Aesch. *Choeph.* 1048 σφ. φαισχίτῶνες (qu. φαισχίτῶνες?) καὶ πεπλεκτανημένα ποικίλοις δράκουσιν, a passage which Euripides seems to have had in mind when writing that under consideration and to have endeavoured to improve on by substituting for πεπλεκτανημένα ποικίλοις δράκουσιν, the graphic δειναῖς ἐχίδναις ἐστομωμένη. Likewise, for the rather neutral term φαισχίτῶνες he gives us the vivid image of a fury emitting fire and blood (cf. Aesch. *Choeph.* 1058) from her garments as she flies.

Secondly, the word ὄχθον (v. 290) was emended by Heimsoeth to ὄγκον. But we certainly look for a term here in apposition to μητέρα (v. 289), for which purpose neither ὄχθον nor ὄγκον seems appropriate. Write rather ἄχθος, an emendation strongly supported by Aesch. *Prom.* 350, ἄχθος οὐκ εὐάγκαλον.

EUR. *Iph. Taur.* v. 1393.

λάβρῳ κλύδωνι συμπεσού' ἡ πείργετο.

The verb ἡπείργετο here is quite unsuitable. The passages from Homer cited in support of it are contrary to Euripides' constant usage. Cf. *Or.* 799, *Herac.* 732, *Phoen.* 1280 (active); *Or.* 1258, *Alc.* 255, *Alc.* 1152, *Herac.* 734, *Ion* 1258, *H.F.* 586, *Phoen.* 1171, *Hipp.* 1185, *Antip.* fr. 183 (Nauck) (middle), in all which passages the verb expresses acceleration or haste. Nor does Pierson's conjecture ἡπείργετο seem entirely satisfactory. Read rather ἀπείργετο. Cf. *Hel.* 1268, πόσον δ' ἀπείργει μῆκας ἐκ γαίης δόρυ; *Alc.* 255 is also instructive.

EUR. *Iph. Taur.* v. 1408,

ἄλλος δὲ πλεκτὰς ἐξανήπτεν ἀγκύλας.

MSS. ἐξανήπτεν ἀγκύρας, contra metrum, emended as above. However, I suspect the reading to have been ἐξανήπτεν ἀγκύλας, corrupted by reference to v. 1351. Cf. *Androm.* 718, πλεκτὰς ἱμάντων στροφίδας ἐξανήσομαι.

* *

THUC. VI. 31. 4.

ξυνέβη δὲ πρὸς τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἅμα ξῖν γενέσθαι, [ὥ τις ἕκαστος προσετὰρχθη] καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλληνας ἐπίδειξιν μᾶλλον εἰκασθῆναι κ.τ.λ.

The words bracketed are unnecessary, disturbing and obscure. May they not have crept into the text from a scholion on the close of the preceding sentence, to which the first clause of the above forms an ἐπανάληψις, the scholion in its original form running somewhat as follows: Τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα σκευῶν οἱ μὲν ὅπλῃται ὅπλα εἶχον, οἱ δὲ ἐρέται καὶ τέκτονες καὶ λιθουργοὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἐργαλεῖα <ὥ τις ἕκαστος προσετὰρχθη>?

MOITIMER LAMSON EARLE,
Bernard College, New York.

* *

ÆSCH. I. 13.—ἀποθανόντα δ' αὐτὸν θαπτέτω καὶ τᾶλλα ποιεῖτω τὰ νομιζόμενα. The scholiast's note on τὰ νομιζόμενα has been altered without necessity. It is this: σπένδειν, ἀπάρχεσθαι, τὰς ἡμέρας ἐπιτελεῖν. Scheibe and Schultz read τὰ ἡρία ἐπιτελεῖν. In support of τὰς ἡμέρας it is enough to refer to *Diog. Laert.* 10, 18 συνελεῖτωσαν δὲ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμέραν τοῦ Ποσειδεῶνος καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς and to Ammon. *In Diff. Voc.* p. 35 γενέσια ἐπὶ τῶν τευθηκότων ἐν ἡ ἕκαστος ἡμέρᾳ τετελεῦτηκε.

W. WYSE.

* *

DEM. 24. 120.—διαφέρει δὲ τοσούτων αὐτῶν ἡ ἰεουσύλια τῶν ἄλλων ὅτι τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ἀνένεγκαν εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, δέον αὐτοῖς. Is not this a corrupted gloss on the preceding sentence (τὰς δεκάτας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰς πεντηκοστὰς τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν σεσυληκότες καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοὶ ἐχοντες), the words τὴν ἀρχὴν having been originally τὴν ἀπαρχήν?

W. WYSE.

* *

μὺς πίττης γεύεται. In his article on *Theocritus and Herodas* (*Class. Rev.* vi. 85) Mr. Kynaston quotes this proverb, and suggests that it is 'applica-

ble to one who has been attracted by the hope of gain, and finds that he has been inextricably entangled in something particularly disagreeable.' In support of this view I would refer to *Dem. c. Polycl.* p. 1215. The friends of Apollodorus had asked Polycles to come and take up the command of the trireme, as he was legally bound to do, and explained the extra expense to which Apollodorus had been put by his delay. Polycles paid no attention, γελᾶσαντα δ' ἔφασαν αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν 'ἄρτι μὺς πίττης γεύεται' ἐβούλετο γὰρ Ἀθηναῖος εἶναι. The meaning of this is clear. Apollodorus would become an Athenian citizen, and now finds that he must pay for the privilege. This is obscured by the reading of Dindorf (3rd ed. 1886) who prints 'ἄρτι μὺς πίττης γεύεται.' ἐβούλετο κ.τ.λ. as though the subject of ἐβούλετο was Polycles. Much to the same effect is the explanation given by Erasmus, *Adag. Chil.* ii. cent. iii. 68, and by Liddell and Scott, *s.v.* 7th edition. A somewhat similar proverb is cited in the *Dictionary of the Spanish Academy*, 1783, *s.v.* *Ratón*—'Ratones arriba que todo lo blanco no es harina'—and is there explained to mean that persons attracted to a thing by its outward appearance are liable to be deceived.

HERBERT W. GREENE.

* *

Plautus, Casina 523, 4.—Whether 'the black-bird is securely caged' in these verses, as Mr. Lindsay humorously says, or not, I will not undertake to say. Perhaps he is right. But I fear the bars within which he proposes to confine it are not strong enough to prevent its escape. His emendation *Sed facito dum mēcula per uorsūs quod cantat cōlas*

'cibo

Cūm suo, cum quiqui' facito ut ueniant quasi cant Sātrium

is not acceptable because of the combination of metrical defects in the first line. (i.) The caesura ought to come after the thesis of the fourth foot, or if after the arsis then not between two such intimately associated words as a preposition and its case. (ii.) The accentuation *pér uorsūs* (which is equivalent to a molossus) is unplautine in this place of the verse, though it would not be wrong before the final *—c—c—*. (iii.) The harshness *cōlās cū-*, which Mr. Lindsay says can be got over, would I think be hard to parallel in the foot which *Plautus* treated with special delicacy—the seventh of this metre.

E. A. SONNENSCHIEIN.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

MURRAY (A. S.). *A History of Greek Sculpture*. In two volumes. Revised edition. With illustrations. London, John Murray, 1890.

In 1880 Mr. Murray published his *History of Greek Sculpture from the Earliest Times down to the Age of Pheidias*; three years later there followed a *History of Greek Sculpture under Pheidias and his Successors*.

Both volumes met with the applause which they well deserved. It is very satisfactory to find that an archaeological work of so serious a character as this should already after so short a time has elapsed require a second edition: and this notwithstanding the competition of the works by Mr. Perry and the late Mrs. Mitchell dealing with the same subject.

As this success shows that Mr. Murray's

book is widely known, it would be superfluous here to give an analysis of the work as a whole; it will be sufficient to call attention to those chapters or sections which have undergone considerable changes. Thus the second volume may be left entirely aside, inasmuch as the revision does not go beyond the back of the title-page, which contains the correction of some quotations according to the new pagination of the revised first volume. Moreover, in the first volume (see preface), study and research have been devoted to the archaic statues found recently on the Acropolis at Athens and in various isolated localities of Greece, largely to the exclusion of everything else: besides this we have a rearrangement of the chapters on early sculpture, particularly that of the sixth century. I propose to examine first the new paragraphs, and afterwards the rearrangements introduced.

The new additions affect principally Chap. VI., which treats of the archaic sculpture of the Ionian islands and of Athens. The clearing of the Acropolis, thanks to Kabbadias' efforts, has brought to light archaic sculptures of the greatest interest, which enable us to follow closely the development of sculpture in Attica from about the time of Solon down to the Persian invasion; a chapter of Greek art of which we had hitherto only a very slight knowledge. At the commencement of this period stand the very archaic pedimental sculptures, belonging to different temples, and executed in the local *poros* stone. The next stage is marked by the use of the bluish Hymettian marble. Then we have the immigration of sculptors in marble from the Ionian coast and the islands of Samos, Chios and Paros; with these are gradually associated Attic artists, and all for the most part work in Parian marble. Endoios, probably of Ionian origin, and the Athenian Antenor, are the most conspicuous names of this Peisistratic era. Towards the end of this period a new and as it were opposing influence seems to have set in from the neighbouring Dorian parts of the Peloponnesos; this is shown to have been the case by the recent discovery of inscriptions recording the names of the Aeginetan artists Kalon (thus spelt, not 'Kallon' p. 199 &c.) and Onatas; and also by the references in literature to Hageladas of Argos and the Dorian Kleotas. This influence gives an entirely new direction to Attic sculpture in the period between the expulsion of the tyrants and the Persian Wars; marble is replaced by bronze, and the predilection for draped female statues

yields to the representation of the nude male figure. Antenor himself, Kritios and Nesiotes, Hegias, and to a certain extent even Myron, are examples of this Doric influence. And in this way, from two different sources, the ground was prepared for that grand Attic sculpture which we are accustomed to connect with the name of Pheidias.

It would be difficult to conceive a more alluring subject for the research and descriptive powers of an historian; and there is no lack of disquisitions duly appreciative of this series of revelations. I cannot however admit that Mr. Murray's sixth chapter does it full justice. The archaic pediments representing Herakles struggling with the hydra or with Triton, and Zeus conquering Typhon, with their ingenuity of composition, their coarseness of style, and their predilection for bright colouring, are entirely omitted from this chapter; they are relegated, as being reliefs, to the fifth chapter, which deals with sculpture in relief, and even there they are referred to in so cursory a manner that it is impossible to estimate their real importance (p. 138). In their place, at the head of Chap. VI., the author places the *incunabula* of Ionian art, that is to say, the statues recently discovered in Delos and Samos, and identified by the inscriptions of Nikandre, Cheramyes and Archermos. Archermos leads up to the school of Chios; at the head of this school we are surprised to find still standing the name of Melas (p. 152); this is due to a misunderstanding of Pliny or of the source from which he drew his information; as a matter of fact, the words *Mélaivos παρσίον ἄστυ* in the inscription of the Nike refer unmistakably to Melas, the mythical founder of Chios.

Next to these works of the Nesiotic school are placed the wonderful series of female statues, recently resuscitated from their common tomb on the Acropolis and justly styled by Mr. Murray 'the most marvellous and amazing find of later years.' The author is inclined to take them partly for Horae and Graces, partly as canephoroi, explaining (as I think, wrongly) the holes visible on the crown of some of the heads as intended for the attachment of baskets of bronze. If however we consider this noble series of figures, the variety of their ages, and the manifold rendering of individual characteristic features, we cannot but accept them as the portraits of Athenian ladies of the Peisistratic epoch, dedicated by themselves or their relatives to Athena Polias; allowing of course for diffe-

rences of style and of date within the limits of that epoch. The reader of Mr. Murray's book can hardly form an adequate idea of the great artistic importance and varied character of these figures, which are the most striking feature of the Acropolis Museum. Moreover we should have expected some reference to the much debated question, as to how far these statues are original productions of the Nesiotic artists, or how far they are works of Attic sculptors trained by their Ionian kinsmen; a question which, in its bearing on the history of art (and especially of Attic art), is beyond doubt the most important one connected with these sculptures.

One of the finest and most imposing of these female statues, ascribed by Studniczka to Antenor (the inscription of which is given in two different restorations on p. 158 and p. 159), is considered by Mr. Murray as an undoubted work of that artist. Mr. Murray further agrees with Studniczka in assigning the Naples *tyrannoktonoi* to the school of Antenor, from a comparison between the head of that statue and the head of the Naples Harmodios. This however will hardly be the general opinion; even Studniczka himself has now come round to the view that the Naples statues must rather be a copy of the group made thirty years later by Kritios and Nesiotas. Again, the statue of a man carrying a calf on his shoulders, dedicated by one Kombos, is ascribed (p. 164), on the evidence of the inscription, to the first half of the sixth century, and at the same time to the period of Antenor who made the group of the *tyrannoktonoi* after 510 B.C. Surely this implies a manifest contradiction in terms. There can really be no doubt as to the palaeographical evidence; the Kombos group (in Hymettian marble) is earlier than most of the female statues, and seems to be anterior to the introduction of Nesiotic sculpture and Parian marble. Moreover this *pastor bonus* should not be styled Hermes, an attribution with which the close-fitting coat does not coincide; why should it not be a likeness of Kombos, who thus dedicates in *effigie* both himself and an ἀπαρχή of his flock to the goddess?

In this chapter we look in vain for the name of Endoios, who however is certainly one of the most important sculptors of that epoch working at Athens; Mr. Murray himself quotes Loeschke's very probable suggestion that the artist had migrated thither from Ionia. He is however relegated to Chap. VII, which deals with the

Peloponnesian school of Dipoinos and Skyllis, the Cretan pupils of Daidalos, merely because an easy intelligible tradition speaks of him as a friend and follower of Daidalos. As a matter of fact, he has nothing to do with that school. Mr. Murray treats Daidalos much too seriously as a real artist (p. 67); the designation of Δαίδαλον μαθητής is far too general to imply a real connection of school, and as a matter of fact Attica had its own Δαϊδαλίδαι, a name which in no wise in ancient literature is given to the 'followers of Daidalos' in Crete or in the Peloponnesos. On the other hand, we possess Attic inscriptions of Endoios, and we have the marble Athena from the Acropolis, in which we are sufficiently entitled to recognize an original work by Endoios. Consequently, I think, the more proper place for Endoios would have been the sixth chapter; while Onatas the Aeginetan, who is referred to in the Attic chapter on account of an inscription found on the Acropolis (p. 166), should not have been separated from the school of Aegina (ch. VIII. and IX.).

Another gap in the description of Attic sculpture of this period is caused by the omission of the very remarkable marble fragments (including the upper part of an Athena), in which Studniczka has recognized the remains of a Gigantomachia forming the pedimental composition of the Peisistratic Hekatompedon. Mr. Murray does not mention them; and yet they are of supreme interest, not only on account of their style, but also as bearing on the development of pedimental composition during the sixth century. On the other hand, Mr. Murray thinks the Strangford Apollo may possibly be ascribed to Attic art (p. 175). I am inclined to agree with Brunn as to the similarity of this statue to Aeginetan sculptures; and I see no reason to doubt Newton's statement (*Essays*, p. 81) that this statue was found on the Doric island of Anaphé near Thera.

Any description of the development of early Attic sculpture must necessarily be incomplete if confined to statuary alone; it must also include the reliefs, of which the masterly treatment was from the first a prominent feature of Attic sculpture. I have already mentioned that Mr. Murray has preferred to assign to Attic reliefs a modest place at the end of Chap. V., which deals with 'archaic sculpture in relief' (p. 138). This division of the subject may be convenient for the purpose of facilitating the reader's search for individual monuments,

but it seriously impairs the completeness and clearness of the purview of Attic art. The stele of Aristion, for instance, and its numerous companions, the painted stele of Lyseas, the bases bearing the name of the Parian sculptor Aristion, the relief representing a figure stepping into a chariot, should not be separated from the rest of Attic sculpture; nor should the bronze relief of Athena (p. 144) be separated from the statue of the Polias, as represented by the late Dresden copy (of which, to be sure, Mr. Murray says nothing). As to the stele of Aristion, the name written in the usual place on the base must necessarily be that of the man buried in the grave and represented in the relief; it is not even grammatically possible that it is the name of the father of the sculptor, whose name is inscribed on the stele itself (*ἔργον Ἀριστοκλέους*); this view has long since been abandoned (p. 140 note 1). Neither can Kleoitias be a son of this Aristokles, nor even an Attic artist at all (p. 142), since both his name and the form *εἰπάτο* which he employs are un-Attic. Lastly, the supposition that the relief with the figure stepping into a chariot may have 'belonged to the metopes of the Hecatompedon' is consistent neither with the square shape necessary for a metope, nor with our actual knowledge of the pre-Periclean temple.

I have hitherto confined myself to Attic sculpture, wishing to prove that this part of the book, which has undergone the greatest change, needed a still more thorough recasting than the author has thought necessary. There are some other parts of the book which required a similar revision, both as regards general subjects (such as the characteristics of Myron, the questions connected with the athletes of Polykleitos, and with the 'Ephesian' statues of Amazons) and also in reference to certain minor faults which ought not to have gone through two editions (p. 74 *ἐῖλοι διοπετής*; p. 253 *capillam*; p. 187 l. 25 'relief' instead of 'belief'; p. 258 note 3, 1784 for 1874; p. 258 l. 3 'and an Athene' omitted; p. 186 Kylon instead of Isagoras; p. 213 the prophylactic eyes on the vase of Euphorbos interpreted as an abbreviation of Apollo). But it would exceed the limits of this article to dwell on these points. I prefer to point out some other paragraphs which are either new additions or have undergone considerable changes. On p. 60 Mr. Murray, speaking of the Mycenaean lions, says 'The natural guardian for a city gate was one lion not two. The mere notion of two lions

standing thus confronted, is ridiculous.' I think this method of reasoning too realistic. A glance at Curtius' paper *über Wappengebrauch*, a comparison of kindred reliefs discovered in Phrygia by Mr. Ramsay, of the two lions of the Nereid monument, or those of the sepulchral chamber of Alexander the Great (Diod. 18, 27), of the many lions watching the tomb of Mausolos, are sufficient to show that there is no need of any special interpretation for the two lions on the gate of Mycenae. On p. 85, apropos of the interesting bronze bust from Vulci, is a discussion as to the conditions of the technique and style of bronze work in the latter half of the seventh century; the author justly remarks that this bust represents the form of art prevalent among the Oriental Greeks of Egypt (or Cyprus?) rather than among those of Greece proper or the western colonies. On p. 90 Mr. Murray proposes a new and ingenious restoration of the throne of the Amyklaean Apollo. His drawing represents what might be called a throne, but one which appears to be inconsistent with the expression of Pausanias *ὑπελθεῖν ὑπὸ τὸν θρόνον*: we should require rather *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν θρόνον*. The paragraph dealing with the Assos sculptures (p. 104) has undergone some remodelling, with special reference to the discoveries of Clarke and his companions; the name of the adversary of Herakles here should not be 'Nereus' (who is always represented in complete human form), but Triton, or rather *ἄλιος γέρον*; and whether it is an improvement to ascribe the temple to the seventh century B.C. instead of the middle of the sixth century (as was done in the former edition) I am far from feeling sure. On p. 107 is reproduced an interesting relief from the necropolis of Sardes. The next pages give a *résumé* of Mr. Murray's very happy reconstruction of the base of one of the archaic columns of the Ephesian temple, as suggested by him recently in the *Hellenic Journal*; I doubt however whether there is sufficient reason to ascribe these reliefs to Bupalos. On p. 125 the reproduction of an unpublished fragment from Xanthos with dancing or running women, similar to the Nereids on the Assos frieze, deserves our acknowledgment. On pp. 172 and 174 are additions to the paragraph dealing with the archaic statues of 'Apollo.' It is strange that it is not more generally acknowledged that this type in earlier archaic art represents simply 'the man,' a god as well as a mortal, and that it is often difficult or impossible to decide whether of the

two is intended to be represented in the individual copies. Such a decision is indeed of little importance; the history of this type (which originated perhaps, as Friedrichs supposed, in the imitation of Egyptian statues) is the history of the development of the male figure in sculpture; and there is sufficient evidence to prove Ulrichs' conjecture that this development, in its more perfect stages, is mainly due to Dipoinos and Skyllis, and their followers Tektaios and Angelion, Kanachos &c.

The re-arrangements introduced in the new edition concern the chapters IV. to VII. One of the main points is the separation of the sculpture in relief from the statuary. We have already indicated both the advantages and the shortcomings of this system. The chest of Kypselos, which formerly occupied its place in the third chapter, between the Homeric shield and the lions of Mycenae, has now been removed to the beginning of Ch. IV., immediately preceding Butades' invention of modelling in clay. As Mr. Murray places the origin of the chest, according to the legend, about 700 B.C., he might have left it at its former place; if we assign it, with Klein and others, to the time of the Kypselidae, a more convenient place for it would be in the neighbourhood of Dontas and Dorykleidas, of Hegylos and Theokles, the pupils of Dipoinos and Skyllis, who transplanted into statuary the old Homeric art of using wood, ivory and gold for domestic utensils, an art of which the chest of Kypselos represents only a more perfect form. Thus it would also stand near the throne of the Amyklaean Apollon, which offers so many analogies with it. As it now stands, the transition from the shield of Herakles to the lions of Mycenae (p. 59) has become somewhat abrupt, and so is also the transition from the chest of Kypselos to Butades (p. 72). The same observation applies to p. 87, where the mention of Athens and of certain works at Sparta and Amyklæe 'already mentioned' has lost its meaning, since Endoios and the group of Spartan wood-engravers, Dontas &c., who preceded in the former edition, have been thence removed to a later place (p. 179). Nor is the beginning of Ch. VII., which refers to working in relief, any longer in its appropriate place, since sculpture in relief is done with in Ch. V., and the whole of Chapter VI. has been already devoted to statuary. A real improvement is to be acknowledged in the new place assigned to the paragraph on sculpture in Northern

Greece. Instead of being discussed at the end of the volume, after Pythagoras, Myron and Polykleitos, Northern Greece has now found its convenient place at the end of Ionian sculpture (p. 131). But why this remark in reference to the Thasian relief: 'What the monument may have been is unknown, unless it may have served the same purpose as the Harpy-tomb' (p. 135)? The inscription speaks as clearly as possible: *Νύμφησιν κάπóλλωνι νυμφηγέτη θήλυ καὶ ἄρσεν ἄμ βοῦλη προσέρδεν &c., and Χάρισιν αἶγα οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ χοῖρον.* For the rest, I beg to refer to an article of mine in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, vol. v. p. 417.

The numerous new illustrations of the second edition are very satisfactory, with the exception of that of the Nikè of Archermos (p. 151), which might have been restored more correctly from the analogous monuments compared by Petersen. Of the old illustrations, pl. v. and those on pp. 259 and 282 are taken from antiquated originals; the last one contains precisely the fault spoken of p. 281 note 2. The restored column of the treasury of Atreus, p. 64, ought to be reversed; the apparent base, as is evident for technical reasons, being really the capital, and the shaft of the column tapering downwards, exactly as is the case in the column on the relief of the lions. The illustrations reproduced at p. 113 (head from Ephesos), 171 and pl. vi. (statues of Apollo), p. 241 and 293 (metopes of Selinus), p. 320 (head of Amazon), in a new edition should be replaced by better ones; they are wanting both in style and character. Finally it may be worth noticing that the well-known marble chair is not at Athens, but has been for some eighty years in Mr. Murray's own country, in Scotland, at Broom Hall, the seat of Lord Elgin.

It is the unpleasant duty of a reviewer to point out principally those parts of a book which seem to be less successfully or correctly treated. It would be unfair not to state that nevertheless Mr. Murray's book deserves on the whole our grateful acknowledgment, and that, on the occasion of a third edition, it would not be difficult to assure to it, by the aid of a more thorough revision, that high place in archaeological literature which it deserves to occupy.

AD. MICHAELIS.

Pictorial Atlas to Homer's Iliad and Odyssey.

Thirty-six plates containing 225 illustrations from works of Ancient Art, with descriptive text and an epitome of the

contents of each book. For the use of schools and students of literature and art. By Dr. R. ENGELMANN and W. C. F. ANDERSON, M.A. Grevel & Co., 33, King Street, W.C. 1892.

MR. ANDERSON has done valuable work in preparing this English edition of Engelmann's well-known *Homeric Atlas*. An elementary German book always needs, if it is to meet English wants, not only much revision but also substantial additions. In German form the work is advisedly final—the elementary student is to go thus far and no farther; hence there are no references either to tempt the student to verify statements or to push investigation a step beyond. In England intellectual classes are not so sharply divided—hence a popular book must be so ordered that it may serve as a stepping-stone. The English edition is about three times the size of the original. It supplies as new material 'an epitome of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; notes on the dates, style, provenance and present home of the selected works of art; and sufficient reference to standard authorities to make the book useful not only to the advanced student but also to the ordinary reader.' These additions, we may say at once, are all clear gain, and have been admirably planned.

The illustrations, which are naturally the main gist of the book, vary much in merit. Some, as e.g. the reproductions of the Esquiline landscapes (Plate VII.), are admirable; others, e.g. XI. 70 Hermes and the nymphs, XIII. 75, are most distressing caricatures of beautiful works of art. When will a publisher be found bold enough, if he cannot afford to better such monstrosities, to omit them wholly? The titles underneath the plates have been printed abroad, and apparently the proofs never revised. Some blunders are too ludicrous to be misleading, but Δέβης for Αἰβης (XV.), Achaeaus for Achaeans, Chinsi for Chiusi, Cornets for Corneto, Laestrygians for Laestrygonians, Chiayamonti for Chiaramonti are undesirable in an elementary book. In his comments and interpretations Mr. Anderson is well abreast with modern exegesis, but we think a trifle dogmatic on most points, even for a popular work: e.g. Plate XII. 67 he says 'Hypnos lulling Ariadne to sleep,' and adds 'Hypnos is winged and youthful and almost identical with Eros, with whom in fact some commentators have confused him here,' but 'there can be no doubt about the identification (with Hypnos) here.' There is every doubt, or rather we should say almost certainty of the

old identification with Eros: it is Eros crowning Ariadne, the type-form selected being Hypnos lulling Alkyoneus. Hypnos was an ingenious and novel suggestion, and the type-form of Hypnos and Alkyoneus needed to be brought forward, but the old interpretation remains to our minds unshaken. Still, isolated lapses do not interfere with a general soundness and undoubted alertness.

The *Pictorial Atlas* is in fact a Greek illustrated Bible, for Homer was the Bible of classical times. We wish Mr. Anderson had added Prof. Robertson Smith's memorable words, which should be graven on the hearts of all mythologists: 'If the Homeric poems were the Bible of the Greeks, as has been so often said, the true meaning of the phrase is this, that in these poems utterance was given to ideas about the gods which broke through the limitations of local and tribal worship, and held forth to all the Greeks a certain common stock of religious ideas and motives.'

J. E. H.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Alchester, Oxon.—Excavations have been set on foot here, on the site of the ancient Alaua on Akeman Street. Among other discoveries may be mentioned that of a large gravelled court, whose north-west wall has now been laid bare. In the middle of the north side is a square room with pilaster-buttresses on its outer walls and a round stone-lined pit at the south-west corner. The layer of ashes found at several points, and the fragments of blackened pottery and tiles glazed by strong heat, suggest that the building was destroyed by fire. Twelve distinct types of earthenware were discovered, but only two or three pots can be put together at all completely. Fragments of Samian ware, both plain and stamped, are common; also coins, which cover the period between Nero and Honorius.¹

ITALY.

Nocera Umbra, in Umbria.—Remains of an ancient sanctuary have been found here, consisting of outworks of a large wall of tufa blocks, and, at a short distance, a smaller wall of varied construction, chiefly *opus incertum*. The second wall is not parallel to the first, but converges to it at an acute angle. Between these two walls numerous objects were found, chiefly consisting of bronze statuettes. These were formed for the most part from *laminæ*, and represent warriors with helmets and spears, or more probably the god Mars. A statuette of cast bronze represents a female figure with patera and censer. Of sculpture was found a fragment of an archaic male figure, of good workmanship, apparently a youth with breast-plate and chlamys, the hips being greatly exaggerated. Two terra-cotta female heads were also found. These appear to be votive

¹ *Academy*, 9 April.

gifts to some deity of which this place formed a sanctuary. Numerous coins were found here, chiefly Greek and Roman silver money, the Greek being of the fifth century B.C. The most interesting are a small bronze of Catania, with heads of Isis and Serapis joined, on the reverse two ears of corn and the legend ΚΑΤΑΝΑΙΩΝ, and a silver didrachm of Neapolis, with a somewhat archaic female head on obverse, on the reverse a man-faced bull crowned by Victory. In the neighbourhood of the sanctuary are remains of private houses, including the pavement of a *calidarium*, of the type known as *suspensura*, about twenty metres from which was a furnace.²

Guarcino, Latium.—A Roman house has been brought to light, with walls of *opus reticulatum* in local stone, the date apparently about the second century of our era. It is formed of seven chambers decreasing towards one end, lined with *signinum*. In these are two mosaic pavements of black and white tesserae, also fragments of painted stucco and of white and coloured marble. In the neighbourhood is a more ancient construction, apparently an aqueduct, formed by a deep cutting in the rock with substructions and walls of *emplecton* masonry. The aqueduct entered the mountain, forming a *specus*, and debouched in a fountain.³

S. Vittorino, in the Sabine territory.—An important inscription has been found here relating to an aqueduct. It describes minutely the position of the various *castella*, and the distance from one to the other. The use of √ for the number fifty is an indication of its early date. *Af* for *ab* occurs before V.³

At *Laculo* in the same territory, at the entrance of the church of S. Pietro, is an ancient block of limestone inscribed: Q. MYRRIVS. CNF | VACVNAE. VOT... | DAT. LYBENS. MERIT... The existence of this inscription was known, but its position has only recently been discovered, as previous investigators had looked for it at Baecugno, taking that place to represent the ancient Vacunae. There seems however to be no reason for doubting that here we have the *fanum Vacunae* by which Horace wrote the tenth Epistle of the first book.³

SICILY.

Avola.—A treasure of coins has been discovered, about 2000 in number, mostly tetradrachms of the fifth century B.C., and all silver. The majority belong to Syracuse, the rest to Gela, Agrigentum, and Leontini. Of Agrigentine coins there is a series from 472 to 415 B.C., also a few didrachms; of Gela, tetradrachms from 466 to 415, on the obverse a man with bull's head, on the reverse a biga crowned by Nike, and three didrachms with horsemen; of Leontini, tetradrachms with head of Apollo and lion, of mature archaic art, and others from 466 to 422 B.C. The earliest Syracusan coins are six incuse tetradrachms, two of which are inscribed ΣΥΡΑΦΟ-ΣΥΩΝ, the others merely ΣΥΡΑ. These belong to the time of the γεώμοροι, before 485 B.C. The rest are mainly tetradrachms of the usual types, with very varied legends; those of the end of the fifth century are conspicuously absent.³

Castelluccio.—Dr. Orsi's excavations here have produced some important results, as they seem to establish a connection between the Sicels and the inhabitants of Hissarlik. Among the contents of the tombs in the Sicel necropolis were numerous vases with brown designs on red or yellow ground,

the favourite shape being a kind of skyphos, perhaps representing the δέπας ἀμφικόπελλον (cf. Schliemann, *Ilios*, p. 456, fig. 1179); also some two-edged bronze knives of Mycenaean type, delicately worked. Not far off were remains of a village, where similar knives were found, also vases, some of the primitive geometrical type. Remains of two very ancient dwellings were brought to light, the first of rectangular shape, built of irregular masonry, containing fragments of large vases and σαλῆρες. The second was larger, and contained remains of tiles, etc.; it consists of an αὐλή and two dwelling-rooms. They seem to resemble the dwellings found at Hissarlik. Other tombs were found in the neighbourhood, all of Sicel type, in one of which was found a large Corinthian oinochoe, almost identical with one published in the *Jahrbuch* for 1889, pl. v. fig. 5.³

Grammichele.—A necropolis has been discovered here, with walled and tiled tombs. In one was a terra-cotta sarcophagus with a cornice and small fascia with a pattern of leaves, surmounted by six small acroteria.³

Priolo.—A quadrangular *cippus* of limestone was lately found here, on the front of which was a *tabula ansata* inscribed: ΕΥΤΥΧΗCXPH[C]T |

O///KAIMA | C/////// | CCZHCEETHA.

Below is a representation of a *mola versatilis*, with the upper millstone (*σῶς, catillus*), and the lower (*μύλη, meta*), and the handle (*κόπη, molit*) by which it was turned. Over the handle is the figure of a boy, and over the mouth of the *catillus* a wheel of ten spokes turned by a man. The connection of the wheel with the mill is not evident from the design, but a water-mill may perhaps be represented.³

GREECE.

Athens.—Dr. Dörpfeld, continuing his excavations between the Areopagus and the Phnyx, came across three terminal stelae *in situ*, one inscribed in archaic letters and belonging at least to the beginning of the fifth century B.C., the other two in letters of the end of the fifth century or beginning of the fourth. The same inscription occurs on all: Ὅρος Δέσσης. Near these stelae was found a small building, forming three sides of a quadrangle, with an altar on the open side; round it were water-conduits running off in different directions. These constructions evidently belong to the age before the Persian wars. It would seem that this building was a small temple or shrine, such as one would expect to find in the neighbourhood of such a famous fountain as the Enneakranos. This building however seems to have been supplanted by another construction, which served as a *tesche* or club for the Athenian population, as is proved by the inscribed terminal stelae. One of the water-channels empties itself into one of the three basins, the discovery of which was mentioned above, p. 182. Amongst fragments of pottery found on the spot was one with the name of the artist Mys.⁴

Eretria.—In the theatre the eastern half of the orchestra and the eastern *parodos* have been completely disinterred. Parallel to the ancient wall of poros stone, another wall came to light, of marble, and of a later period. The orchestra is somewhat over nine metres in diameter, the proscenium beginning at a distance of 1·25 metres therefrom. From the centre of the orchestra to the back of the proscenium runs a subterranean passage.⁵

H. B. WALTERS.

² *Notizie dei Lincei*, October 1891.
³ *Notizie dei Lincei*, November 1891.

⁴ *Athenaeum*, 26 March.

⁵ *Athenaeum*, 2 April.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Numismatic Chronicle, Third Ser. vol. xi. parts iii. and iv., 1891.

Arthur J. Evans. "Syracusan 'medallions' and their engravers, in the light of recent finds." Pp. 205-376, with 7 plates. An important paper.—*Miscellanea*. 'Find of Coins at Colchester,' by J. Evans. About thirty coins, Hadrian to Severus Alexander; the latest coin in the hoard is of A.D. 223.—'Tityros or Tisyros' by J. N. Svoronos. Explains (on the suggestion of M. A. Skias) the inscription ΤΙΣΥΡΟΙ on Cretan coins (hitherto attributed to Gortyna) as the name of the people of Τίτυρος or Τίτυρος, a town in Crete mentioned only by the Scholiast on Theocritus iii. 2 (ed. Ahrens).—*Reviews &c.* Notices of Babelon's 'Aradus' (*Rev. Num.* 1891) and 'Sidon' (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1891, p. 293) by B. V. Head.

Revue numismatique, 1892. Premier trimestre. J. A. Blanchet. 'Monnaies inédites ou peu connues de la Chersonèse taurique et de la Moésie.' Principally Imperial coins of Tomi, Marcianopolis and Nicopolis, with lists of the monetary magistrates of the two last towns.—Prince P. de Saxe-Cobourg, 'Monnaies grecques inédites ou peu connues' (continued). Coins of Phrygia and Caria, including an unpublished 'cistophorus' of Synnada.

E. Babelon, **Mélanges numismatiques** (1st series). Paris, 1892.

Under this title M. Babelon has gathered together various numismatic articles contributed by him during the last few years to the *Revue numismatique* and other periodicals. Of many of these articles some account has already been given in the numismatic summaries of the *Classical Review*, and I need not perhaps do more than point out here that the volume includes M. Babelon's important monographs on the coins of Marathus and Aradus and his remarkable dissertation on the coinage and chronology of the kings of Sidon. M. Babelon also reprints from the Transactions of the recent Numismatic Congress at Brussels a paper in which he contends that the cruciform object held by Nike on the staters of Alexander the Great is not, as usually supposed by numismatists, a trophy-stand, but the *σπυρίς*, defined by M. Babelon as the support of the *aplustre*. An article on the Phrygian tradition of the Deluge in connexion with the famous coins of Apamea inscribed ΝΩΕ is reprinted from the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, and there is an unpublished account of an Alexandrian coin of Elagabalus on which this Emperor is styled 'Son of Apollo.'

WARWICK WROTH.

Journal of Philology, vol. xx. No. 39, 1891.

J. E. B. Mayor. Quotations from Seneca contained in the works of Alanus, p. 1-6.—A. Platt, Notes on the *Odyssey*, 7-16.—R. Ellis, An Oxford MS. of Statius *Silvae*, 17-24.—A. E. Housman, Sophoclea, 25-48.—A. E. Housman, Remarks on Prof. Nettleship's emendations of the Vatican Glossary, 49-52.—H. Nettleship, Further notes on the Vatican Glossary, 52-62.—H. E. Malden, Caesar's Invasion of Britain, a reply to Mr. Ridgway, 63-64.—C. Taylor maintains, in opposition to Mr. Cotterill, that Antiochus in his *Homilies* has borrowed from Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, and not *vice versa*, 65-110.—G. Young

discusses the meaning of οἰδῶνος in Soph. O. T., 111-112.—A. Platt, Notes on Lycophron's *Alexandra* and the *Lithica*, 113-120.—G. Lowes Dickinson, A criticism on Dr. Jackson's exposition of Plato's later theory of Ideas, 121-133.—W. M. Lindsay, On the influence of the Accent in Plautine Metre, 135-158.

No 40. 1892. R. Ellis, Lucretius III. 1011, p. 159-161.—W. R. Paton, Emendations in Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, 162-174.—H. Nettleship, Notes in Latin Lexicography, 175-181.—H. Nettleship, Vatican Glossary, 183-190.—A. G. Peskett, Caesar's Invasions of Britain, 191-201.—H. Macnaghten, Emendations in the *Helena* of Euripides, 201-206.—R. Ellis, Rehdiger MS. of *Acta*, 207-236.—W. Leaf, The MSS. of the *Iliad* II., p. 237-251.—J. E. B. Mayor, Notes on Juv. VIII., p. 252-293.—W. Headlam, Various conjectures, 294-311.—J. P. Postgate, Emendations in Tibullus and Martial, 312-314.—J. D. Duff, Notes on Lucretius I. 564, II. 1081, p. 315-318.

Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin. January 1891.

CICERO'S SPEECHES BY F. LUTERBACHER.

I. Editions. *Für Ser. Roscius aus America*, by G. Lundgraf. 2nd edition, Gotha 1889. The commentary improved in many places. *Für Ser. Roscius*, by Fr. Richter. 3rd edition by Alf. Fleckeisen, Leipzig 1889. The text carefully revised. *Orationes selectae*, by Al. Kornitzer. In six parts, in C. Verrem IV., in C. Verrem V., de imp. Cn. Pompei, pro Sulla and pro Archia poeta, pro P. Sestio, Philippica Secunda, Vindob. 1889, '90. Each speech has a Latin introduction, and each small vol. a detailed index of names, and list of variations from C. F. W. Müller's edition. In C. Verrem *orationes*, *Actio Secunda*, *Lib. v. de suppliciis*, by Émile Thomas, 3rd edition, Paris 1889. *Ueber das Imperium des Cn. Pompeius*, by A. Deuerling. 2nd edition, Gotha 1889. The text founded on that of C. F. W. Müller. *De imperio Cn. Pompei*, by F. Thümen, Berlin 1890. Much too elaborate for school use. *Reden gegen L. Sergius Catilina*, by Karl Hachtmann, Gotha 1890. *Oratio pro Archia*, by Émile Thomas. 2nd edition, Paris 1890. Condensed from the larger edition, with thirteen engravings of busts and coins.

II. Contributions to criticism and interpretation. *Das Kriminalgerichtswesen der römischen Republik*, by W. Geers. Progr. Chur, 1890. Puts into a short and intelligible form our knowledge of the *judicia publica* in the time of Cicero. *Das Wortspiel in Ciceros Reden*, by Chr. Herwig. Progr. Attendorn, 1889. *Zum Vierten Buche der Verrinen*, by R. Foss. Central-Organ für die Interessen der Realschulwesens. 1889. A supplement to Hachtmann's edition. Contains many errors but the section on the geography of Sicily is well done. In Philol. 47 C. Fr. Müller deals with Pomp. § 24. *Der Prozess des C. Rabirius betreffend verfassungswidrige Gewaltthat*, by A. Schneider. Zürich 1889. An attempt to make clear some of the legal points involved. *Ueber Ciceros erste Rede gegen Catilina* by K. Füsslein. Progr. Merseburg 1889. An excellent defence of the speech against the depreciatory edition of Richter-Eberhard. *De recensenda Ciceronis oratione quam habuit cum senatui gratias agit*, by W. Stock. Genethliaccon Gottingense 1888. A discussion of the MSS. *Zu Ciceros Reden*, by Th. Matthias. N. Jahr. f. Phil.

1889. Twelve places in the *de domo* considered. *Zur Handschriftenkunde der Reden Ciceros in Pisonem, pro Flacco und in M. Antonium*, by Ed. Strübel. Bl. f.d. bayer. GSW. xxv. *Index der in Ciceros Rede für Milo enthaltenen Metaphern und Angabe des Wandels der Wortbedeutung* by Fr. Itzinger. Progr. Budweis 1888, '89. This part is on the verbs, two more to follow, (2) on the substantives, (3) on the adjectives and adverbs. *Cicronis orationis Milonianae dispositio*, by Ml. Grumme. Gera 1889. In Philol. 47 C. Wagener reads *ante hanc diem* in pro Lig. § 1.

The *Leipziger Studien*, vol. xiv. part 1 (1891), contain an elaborate essay by Felix Atenstaedt upon the fragments of Hecataeus. After a careful survey of the evidence and of modern criticisms upon it, the author sums up his conclusion as follows: *Vidimus partim certam, partim admodum probabilem fidem esse testimoniorum, quae Hecataei auctoritatem prae se ferunt: at nullum reperimus indicium, quod vere subiticum originem proderet.*

II. N.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

Burnett (J.) Early Greek Philosophy. 8vo. Black. 10s. 6d.
Clerke (Agnes M.) Familiar Studies in Homer. Crown 8vo. 290 pp. Longman. 7s. 6d.
Euripides. Medea. With Introduction, Notes, Text, and Appendix, by C. B. Heberden. Second Edition, Revised. 12mo. Clarendon Press. 2s.
 With Notes, Appendices, and Vocabulary, by M. A. Bayfield. 18mo. 136 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
Garnett (R.) A Chaplet from the Greek Anthology. Post 8vo. 82 pp. Unwin. 3s. 6d.
Hatch (E.) and *Redpath* (H. A.) A Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. Part I. Imp. 4to. Sewed. Clarendon Press. 21s.
Nall (G. H.) Easy Exercises on First Greek Syntax of the Rev. W. G. Rutherford. Post 8vo. 214 pp. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.

Plutarch. Life of Themistocles. With Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes, Indices, &c., by H. A. Holden. Third Edition, Re-written and Enlarged. 12mo. 270 pp. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
Ridgeway (W.) The origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards. Demy 8vo. With Illustrations. Cambridge Press. 15s. net.
Smith (A. H.) A Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum. Vol. I. 8vo. 3s.
Syracusan 'Medallions' and their Engravers in the Light of Recent Finds, with Observations on the Chronology and Historical Occasions of the Syracusan Coin-Types of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C., and an Essay on some New Artists' Signatures on Sicilian Coins, by Arthur J. Evans. With Seventeen Woodcuts in the Text, and Ten Autotype Plates. 8vo. xiii, 215 pp. Quaritch. 21s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

Apollonios de Rhodes. Les Argonautiques. Traduction française suivie de notes critiques, mythologiques, géographiques, et historiques, et de 2 Index des noms propres, par de la Ville de Mirmont. 4to. xxxii, 480 pp. Paris, Rouam & Co.
Audibert (A.) Études sur l'histoire du droit Romain. I. La Folie et la Prodigalité. 8vo. 342 pp. Paris, Larose & Forcel. 8 f.
Blass (F.) Die Entdeckungen auf dem Gebiete der klassischen Philologie im Jahre 1891. Rede. 8vo. 20 pp. Kiel, Universitäts-Buchhandlung. 1 Mk.
Blümner (H.) Farbenbezeichnungen bei den römischen Dichtern. 8vo. ix, 231 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 7 Mk. 50.
 [Berliner Studien für classische Philologie. Band XIII. Heft 3.]
Bredau (F.) De Callimacho verborum inventore. Dissertatio. 12mo. 98 pp. Breslau.
Brief (S.) Die Conjunctionen bei Polybios. I. Programm. 12mo. 48 pp. Wien.
Bruns (J.) De Dione Chrysostomo et Aristotele critica et exgetica. 4to. 25 pp. Kiel, Universitäts-Buchhandlung. 1 Mk.
Catalogue des livres grecs et latins imprimés par Alde Manuce à Venise 1498-1503-1513. Reproduits en phototypie, avec une préface par H. Omont. Folio. 24 pp. Four Plates. Paris, E. Bouillon. 15 fcs.
Cicero. Rede für L. Murena. Für den Schulge-

branch erklärt von J. Strengo. Ausgabe A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. vi, 73 pp. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 75 pf. Ausgabe B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Heften. vi, 32 und 42 pp. 75 pf.
Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum. Vol. xxv. pars 2. 8vo. Wien, F. Tempsky. 7 Mk. 60.
 [Contents: Sancti Aureli Augustini opera, Sect. vi. pars 2. Contra Felicem, de natura boni, epistula Secundini, contra Secundinum. Accedunt Euodii de fide contra Manicheos et commonitorium Augustini, quod fertur, praefatione utriusque partis praemissa recensuit J. Zycha. lxxxvi, 799-997 pp. (I. and II. 28 Mk.)]
Czyżewicz (A.) De Taciti sermonis proprietatibus praecipue quae ad poetarum dicendi genus pertineant. Pars Posterior. Progr. Brody. 43 S. 8vo.
Dittenberger (W.) De Carolo Reisigio Thuringo. Progr. Halle. 10 S. 4to.
Ehrengruber (S.) De carmine panegyrico Messalae Pseudo-Tibulliano. III. Progr. Kremsmünster. 80 S. 8vo.
Erbiccano (O.) Sizilische Kunst auf Münzen. Diss. Erlangen. 45 S. 8vo.
Ernst (F.) Der Untergang der Angehörigen Alexanders des Grossen. Progr. Prag. 9 S. 8vo.
Fink (J.) Römische Inschriften aus Pfünz. S.-A. München 91. 11 S. m. Abb. 8vo.

- Förster* (H.) Die Sieger in den olympischen Spielen. Teil II. Progr. 4to. 32 pp. Zwickau. Each 1 Mk.
- Götze* (R.) Quaestiones Eumenianae. Diss. Halle. 49 S. 8vo.
- Gregar* (F.) Der Charakter des Kreon nach den drei thebanischen Tragödien des Sophokles. Progr. Mähr.-Trübau. 19 S. 8vo.
- Guljahr*. Der Codex Victorianus des Terenz. S.-A. Leipzig. 29 S. u. 1 Taf. 8vo.
- Herouadae* Mimambi, edidit F. Bücheler. 12mo. iv, 95 pp. Bonn. F. Cohen. 2 Mk. 40.
- Hintner* (F.) Der Pflichtenstreit der Agamemnonskinder in Sophokles' Elektra und seine Lösung. Progr. Luitach. 34 S. 8vo.
- Homeri* Odyssea, in usum scholarum edidit et commentario instruxit J. La Roche. Pars 2. Odysseae XIII-XXIV. 12mo. 206 pp. Leipzig, Freytag. Each 1 Mk.
- Kietz* (G.) Agonistische Studien I. Der Diskoswurf bei den Griechen und seine Künstler. Diss. 8vo. 107 pp. Plate. München. 2 Mk. 50.
- Kuop* (H.) De enuntiatorum apud Isaeum conditionalium et finalium formis et usu. Diss. Erlangen. 35 S. 4to.
- Koch* (J.) De carminibus Prisciani grammatici nomine inscriptis. Diss. Marburg. 23 S. 4to.
- Komers* (A.) Ein Beitrag zur Pflege der lateinischen Sprache in Mähren bis zum Jahre 1620. Progr. Znaim. 20 S. 8vo.
- Koranda* (J.) Beitrag zu den Untersuchungen über Panyasis. Progr. Kremsier. 23 S. 8vo.
- Kornemann* (E.) De civibus romanis in provinciis imperii consistentibus. 8vo. 116 pp. Berlin, Calvary & Co. 4 Mk.
- [Berliner Studien für classische Philologie, Band XIV. Heft 1.]
- La Roche* (J.) Studien zu Theognis. Progr. Linz. 32 S. 8vo.
- Lewicki* (P.) De natura infinitivi atque usu apud Horatium praecipue lyrici. Pars prior. Progr. Lemberg. 25 S. 8vo.
- Lobeck* (O.) Des Flavius Blondus Abhandlung 'De militia et iurisprudencia.' Zum I. Mal herausgegeben. Progr. Dresden. 22 S. 4to.
- Ludwich* (A.) Adnotationes criticae ad scholia in Homeri Iliadem Genavensia. — Die sogenannte voralexandrinische Ilias. Progr. Königsberg. 32 S. 4to.
- Néronatos-Bey*. Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies dans la ville d'Alexandrie et aux environs. 8vo. 15 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- [Extract: Revue archéologique.]
- Niemeyer* (M.) Plantinische Studien. Progr. Potsdam. 16 S. 4to.
- Oehmichen*. Metrologische Beiträge. S.-A. München. 38 S. 8vo.
- Ohnefalsch-Richter* (M.) Die antiken Cultusstätten auf Kypros. Diss. Leipzig. 57 S., 3 Karten u. 15 Taf. 4to.
- Plasberg* (O. de) M. Tullii Ciceronis Hortensio dialogo. Dissertatio. 8vo. 86 pp. Leipzig, Fock. 1 Mk. 80.
- Poëtes moralistes de la Grèce. (Hésiode, Théognis, Callinias, Tyrtée, Mimnerme, Solon, Simonide d'Amorgos, Phocylide, Pythagore, Aristote.) Notices et traductions par Guigniaut, Patin, Girard et Humbert. 18mo. viii, 320 pp. Paris, Garnier frères.
- Poppelreuter* (H.) Die Erkenntnislehre der Stoiker Zenon und Kleanthes. Progr. Coblenz. 20 S. 4to.
- Poppler* (F.) Esse mit einem prädicativen Adverbium bei Sallust und Cäsar. Progr. Bielitz. 33 S. 8vo.
- Radtke* (J.) Observationes criticae in Cornifici libros de arte rhetorica. Diss. 8vo. 62 pp. Königsberg, Koch. 1 Mk.
- Roscher*, jun. (W. H.) Ueber die Reiterstatue Jul. Caesars auf dem Forum Julium und den 'Ἰππος Ἰπποκλούς' einer Münze des Gordianus Pius von Nikaia (Bithynien). S.-A. Leipzig. 58 S. u. 4 Taf. 8vo.
- Rosenbusch* (H.) Quaestiones de parodi in comoedia Atticorum antiquissima compositione. Diss. Marburg. 67 S. 8vo.
- Schilling* (R.) Descholiis Bobiensibus. Diss. Leipzig. 32 S. 4to.
- Schlegel* (G.) Beispielsammlung aus Xenophon zur Einübung der Moduslehre. (Schluss.) Progr. Ung.-Hradisch, 24 S. 8vo.
- Schneider* (A.) Goldtypen des Ostens in Griechischer Kunst. S.-A. Leipzig. 50 S. m. Abb. u. 2 Taf. 8vo.
- Schoenle* (F. L.) Diodorstudien. Diss. Tübingen. 91 S. 8vo.
- Schucht* (H.) De documentis oratoribus atticis insertis et de litis instrumentis prioris adversus Stephanum orationis Demosthenicae. Diss. 8vo. 88 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 20.
- Schulze* (W.) Quaestiones epicae. 8vo. viii, 575 pp. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann. 12 Mk.
- Sjöstrand* (N.) Loci nonnulli grammaticae latinae examinati. Editio II. 8vo. 29 pp. Lund, H. Möller. 80 pfg.
- Sophocles*. Ajax; Les Trachiniennes; Philoctète; Oedipe roi. Traduction en vers français par F. E. Callot. 18mo. 371 pp. Paris, G. Masson. 4 frs.
- Oedipe à Colone. Edition classique accompagnée d'une analyse et de notes philologiques et littéraires par Pessoneaux. 12mo. 102 pp. Paris, Delalain frères. 1 fr.
- Sybel* (L.) Wie die Griechen ihre Kunst erwarben Akademische Rede, 8vo. 22 pp. Marburg, Elwert. 50 Pf.
- Traube*. Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte römischer Schriftsteller. S.-A. München. 42 S. 8vo.
- Trendelenburg* (F. A.) Elementa logicae Aristoteleae. In usum scholarum ex Aristotele excerptis, convertit, illustravit F. A. T. Editio ix. 8vo. xi, 172 pp. Berlin. W. Weber. 2 Mk. 42.
- Wecklein*. Ueber eine Trilogie des Aeschylos und über die Trilogie überhaupt. S.-A. München. 8vo. 50 pp.
- Wendling* (E.) De Peplo Aristotelico quaestiones selectae. Dissertatio. 8vo. 82 pp. Jena, H. Pöhl. 1 Mk. 50.
- Werner* (I.) Quaestiones Baebianae. 8vo. 27 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1 Mk. 50.
- [Berliner Studien für classische Philologie. Band XIV. Heft 2.]
- Wilisch* (E.) Die altkorinthische Thonindustrie. 8vo. viii, 176 pp. plates. Leipzig. E. A. Seemann. 6 Mk.